FOREIGN
BROADCAST
INFORMATION
SERVICE

Daily Report

Supplement

Soviet Union

Congress of People's Deputies
Stenographic Record

FBIS-SOV-89-159-S
Friday
18 August 1989

Soviet Union
SUPPLEMENT
Congress of People's Deputies
Stenographic Record

FBIS-SOV-89-159-S *18 August 1989*

CONTENTS

NOTICE TO READERS: The Daily Report is publishing the full translation of IZVESTIYA's "stenographic record" of the Congress of People's Deputies. Additional supplements will be issued as translated material becomes available.

STENOGRAPHIC RECORD

Congress Proceedings Continue 8 Jun *[IZVESTIYA 10 Jun]* 1

Congress Proceedings Continue 8 Jun
18300698 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
10 Jun 89 Morning Edition pp 1-11

["USSR Congress of People's Deputies. Stenographic Record."—IZVESTIYA headline]

[Text]**Twelfth Session**

8 June 1989. Kremlin Palace of Congresses. 1000.

USSR People's Deputy A.-M.K. Brazauskas is in the chair.

A.-M.K. Brazauskas: Comrades! We are continuing the work of the congress. Please take your seats. Today there are 2,082 people's deputies present at the morning session. We will continue the debates on questions regarding the basic directions of USSR domestic and foreign policy and the government's program of action.

Some more information before we begin.... Later? We can do it later.

Comrade Gennadiy Vasilyevich Bykov has the floor. Comrade Shmelev should get ready.

G.V. Bykov, fitter-installer brigade leader, Leningrad I.I. Leps Scientific-Production Association "Znamya Truda" (Krasnogvardeyskiy Territorial Electoral District, Leningrad): Honorable comrade deputies! It is not easy for me, a worker, to step up to this podium for the first time, but I cannot keep silent, as I feel the need to bring to you all the urgent questions that concern the workers of the city of Leningrad. The electoral campaign and meetings with voters have shown that the people are clearly dissatisfied with the pace at which restructuring is proceeding. The growth of inflation, the shortage of food products and industrial goods, the waiting lines which insult human dignity, the increase in crime, and the general deterioration of the state of affairs in the country all evoke acute dissatisfaction. The reason for this is the lack of proper planning and haste in resolving a number of questions.

Let us recall at least the lack of consideration in the resolution on combatting drunkenness, the extremes in resolving questions regarding cooperatives or the agroprom [agro-industrial complex], and the frequently appearing incomplete legislative statutes. As you well understand, it is the people who must pay for all this. The working class supports restructuring. It supports the quickest possible realization of economic and political reforms. Yet we, the workers, seem to have been left aside from it.

For 4 years, few have been interested in our problems, in those processes which were developing within the working environment, or in our opinion about the course of restructuring. Many organizations in our country are united into various kinds of unions. There is a union of teachers, writers, artists, and even cooperatives. Yet the most massive representative organization of workers does not have its own union. The time has come to recognize the need for bringing together representatives of the working class on a country-wide level. Therefore, I propose that the USSR Supreme Soviet create a union of workers in the very near future.

Comrades! You and I can see how slowly economic reform is developing and how poorly cost accounting is being realized, about which so much is said and written. Having absolved themselves of the responsibility for plan fulfillment, the ministries nevertheless retain in their hands all the resources and the right to distribute the profits we have earned. Talk about the independence and self-management of enterprises will remain merely empty words if these concepts are not backed by an appropriate financial base and a real possibility of making independent decisions. For this purpose, I propose that we review the functions of the ministries, limiting their capacities to decide everything for the enterprises. We also must review the question of reducing their number, thereby reducing the huge expenditures for their maintenance.

As a worker, I would especially like to deal with the question of technical retooling, as I believe that restructuring is impossible without it, just as the improvement in labor conditions of the workers and in the living standard of our people is impossible without it. At the present time, we have a great scientific-technical potential in our country. However, manual labor is retained at many enterprises and old equipment and technology are still being used. Can it be that there are no more bright minds in Russia? Of course not. It is just that we must interest people in thinking constructively.

We must develop conditions that not only stimulate but also activate the work of the scientific-research institutes and design bureaus in this direction on a competitive basis and with independent, objective expert opinion. Only this will enable us in the next few years to acquire new engineering and new technological production, to improve the labor conditions of the workers, and consequently to increase the volume and improve the quality of the manufactured products.

The improvement in working conditions must be combined with accelerated resolution of social questions. After a hard day of work, the worker must rest in normal home surroundings. Yet in Leningrad the general housing problem is very acute, including for the working class.

For many years, Leningrad and other large cities have been replenished with work cadres from rural areas. As a result, as you know, many villages have died out. There is an exodus of the population from the small cities in Russia. Part of Leningrad's working class is comprised of newcomers, former limit workers, who have lived for many years in dormitories and communal apartments

under crowded conditions. A significant portion of the new generation of Leningraders was born and grew up under difficult housing conditions. At the same time, Leningrad residents have not yet fulfilled their sacred duty to the people who survived the blockade, the participants in the Great Patriotic War.

Despite the limitations, the influx of work cadres from other cities to Leningrad continues. Therefore, I propose that we take measures to reduce the growth of the large cities which are already difficult to manage, and not to expand in them the network of industrial enterprises. Each city must make do with its own efforts.

At the same time, we must improve the life of the people in small cities, settlements, and villages, and do everything possible to see that the population does not flee from there. Only these measures, in my opinion, will allow us to gradually resolve many problems in our country, including the housing problem in Leningrad.

Comrades! In meetings with voters during the election campaign, the question of the Law on Cooperatives and their activity was constantly raised. Cooperatives are a good thing, and I support them. I will not dwell on the negative aspects, about which much has been said. This was especially well treated in the speech by Deputy Sherbakov, the chairman of the Moscow City Soviet of Trade Unions. I believe this is the opinion of all the workers. It must alert our government and motivate it to think seriously about this question.

I believe the time has come to review the law on the activity of the cooperatives. We know that the enterprises deduct over half of our income to the state budget. All the people use these funds, including the members of the cooperatives. Yet the cooperatives themselves symbolically transfer to the state budget in some cases 3-5 percent of their profits. Is this fair? Of course not. I support the proposals of the deputies that we place cooperatives under equal conditions with the enterprises and build all mutual relations on a competitive basis.

We, the deputies, like all the Soviet people, fervently greeted and support the announcement by Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov regarding the fact that beginning in 1990 the pension for low-income pensioners will be increased. I believe this is a good beginning. Having corrected the state of affairs in the country, we will be able to further resolve all our social questions.

Comrades! At the beginning of my deputy activity, I encountered a number of questions and with my own eyes became convinced of the inability of the rayon soviet executive committee [rayispolkoms] to resolve certain problems. For example, it turned out that in the headlong rush to provide housing for the population, there was lack of integration in building up our Krasnogvardeyskiy Rayon. I know for a fact that the leaders of our rayispolkom literally had to tear away from the city the social facilities which were specified in the detailed plan outline. People wait for years for the resolution of many social questions, and lose faith in promises. The reason for this, I believe, is that the rayons are still entirely dependent on the city authorities and cannot resolve questions independently.

I know that such a situation has arisen not only here, but also in other regions of our country. Therefore, I propose that we quickly adopt the law on the development of full local self-government and the formulation of the budget of local organs of authority at the expense of enterprises located on their territory. This will allow the rayispolkoms to resolve many questions for themselves.

Comrades! Whatever aspects of restructuring we touch upon, we cannot forget the most important thing—man. I have believed and still believe that the people's deputy must strive toward realizing the basic interests of every honest person. Look for yourselves. Who if not the worker creates material values in our country, and who if not the worker has the shortest, 15-day, vacation? I myself am a worker and understand all too well that in this time it is impossible to restore one's powers so that after the vacation one can continue to work with full return. I believe that the law on vacations of workers and employees must have a clearly defined duration of time—24 work days. (Applause). This is not only the desire, but also the demand of the workers of Leningrad, and I believe all the workers of our country.

In concluding my presentation, I would like to say that the voters have set great tasks before us, and this is as it should be. I have touched upon only the smallest portion of them. Now we must do everything possible to bring these mandates to life. We must do everything possible to bring our country out of that difficult position in which it has found itself. We must do everything to see that the slogan which was proclaimed in 1917, "All power to the soviets!", is brought to life not merely in word, but in deed.

Comrades! Today we have democracy, glasnost, and pluralism of opinion. Everyone can say whatever he wants. Yet I was insulted and hurt to the depths of my soul by the speech of Deputy Karyakin, who spoke about re- intering the body of Vladimir Ilyich Lenin at Volkov cemetery. He said that the people would understand this. No, Comrade Karyakin, the people will not understand. And I, a worker, do not support your proposal. The interment of Vladimir Ilyich Lenin in the mausoleum in Red Square is the will of the people. It is the memory of the people, and we must preserve it in perpetuity. Thank you for your attention. (Applause).

A.-M.K. Brazauskas: Comrade Shmelev has the floor. Comrade Prunskene should get ready.

N.P. Shmelev, doctor of economic sciences, section head at the USSR Academy of Sciences United States of America and Canada Institute, Moscow (from the USSR Academy of Sciences): Honorable Comrade Chairman!

Honorable colleagues! I would like to begin by saying that I as an economist am not too concerned about the long-term prospects for our development. I believe that we as a nation and as a country do not intend to commit suicide and, having tried all thinkable and unthinkable methods of organizing our economic life, we cannot help but enter upon that path which Vladimir Ilyich Lenin defined in the 20's, in the last 2 years of his life, and in his fundamental ideas. Specifically, in the 70 years of our history we have had only 7-8 years of a really effective economy, and we simply cannot avoid returning to this road. We have no other alternative. Yet this requires time. In the West, an average of 8-10 years are needed to bring back a bankrupt, dying company to something viable. Of course, a considerably longer time is needed for such a gigantic economic organism as the Soviet economy.

Yet I am very much concerned with our short-term prospects. I am concerned about the next 2-3 years. I must express my fear that if we do not stop this snowballing inflation, if we do not stop the disintegration of the consumer market and the monstrous, world-record (in relation to the gross national product) budget deficit, within 2-3 years we may be faced with economic collapse.

What awaits us in this case? The scenario for development of events was written 200 years ago, during the time of the French revolution. It has been repeated several times since in history, and we are repeating it with the same sequence as before. We will be faced with a general rationing system, sharp devaluation of the ruble, unbridled expansion of the black market and a shadow economy, disintegration of the consumer market and a forced, I emphasize, forced return to administrative-command discipline in our national economy for some time.

After the speech presented by Nikolay Ivancvich Ryzhkov, I once again became convinced that the country's government and leadership understand that we are faced with such a danger. Yet I have grave doubts as to whether or not they understand the degree of acuteness of this danger. The Council of Ministers has outlined measures for levelling out the market and for reducing the budget deficit. Yet these measures, in my opinion, are insufficient and too long drawn out. While our budget deficit is somewhere on the level of over R100 billion, the measures for economy for this year will reduce it by less than R30 billion, and next year by slightly over R30 billion. The rest will again be the production of the printing presses, again forced loans from our investment holders in savings banks and from our enterprises. I am afraid that our economy will not be able to withstand such a gigantic mass of new monetary additions over what we already have.

Why has this situation arisen? The explanation commonly given is that the rapid growth of wages is responsible for everything. This is not fair. As we saw from yesterday's speech, the increase in wages over the last year was R14 billion, while the budget deficit is in excess of R100 billion. Moreover, comrades, whether we want it or not and regardless of the conditions, our specific conditions, a great historical process has begun. The degree of exploitation of the work force in our country is the highest of all the industrial countries. In our country, about 37-38 percent of the gross national product goes for wages. In the industrial world this indicator comprises 70 or more percent. Our working class has the moral right to increase its share in the gross national product, and it is approaching the resolution of this task by all possible means. Therefore, we must consider this for the future, because to stop this process is impossible. A second commonly given explanation which has resounded here and from the tribunal of the congress is that the co-operators are at fault for everything, that they turn noncash funds into cash. This is a totally incompetent explanation. The annual income of our population is on the order of R430 billion. All the income paid out for wages to co-operators comprises around R2 billion, and of these over a billion is simply a redistribution of money which they already have. Thus, co-operators share less than a fourth of a percent of the blame for the fact that the printing presses are running.

What has led to this situation? Yesterday, Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov rightfully spoke of the heavy legacy which we have inherited. This is true. We have inherited the traditional factors of the budget deficit, and they are retained to the present day. Yet we cannot help but see the situation, which is that over those 3 5-year plans to which our premier referred, the budget deficit averaged R20 billion, while today it is more than R100 billion. This is already a new quality. These are already new reasons, reasons which have emerged in the last 3-4 years, and I would like to point out the most important of these. This, first of all, is the absolutely unqualified statute on the sale of alcoholic beverages which was often mentioned here. This was a noble statute, but as they say, stupidity is often worse than thievery. With good intentions, we dealt a great blow to the equilibrium of the market and to the balance of the budget deficit. The second mistake was the short-term but very painful campaign of 1986 in the struggle against so-called nonlabor income, which dealt a painful blow to our agriculture. The third mistake, which we also could have avoided, was necessitated by the drop in oil prices, the sharp decline in prices, and our forced reduction of imports. Yet we preferred to reduce not grain imports, but the imports of machines and equipment. In doing so, we slashed at the most vital thing on which our state budget was based. We slashed at the import of consumer goods, where a ruble of currency spent on import yields from R8 to R10 of income in the budget, and with proper smart combination of the import structure this coefficient may be increased even more. And finally, there is the last mistake which I cannot explain by any rational arguments. While last year our budget deficit was somewhere at the level of R50-60 billion, this year it has skyrocketed past R100 billion. At the same time, our capital investments have also skyrocketed. Where did

this money come from? This means that from the very beginning the government opted for covering all these expenses with the printing press. There have been no other sources for this growth in capital investments. This was a conscious step toward inflation.

Of course, I do not envy Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov's position. He is being pressured by our not too knowledgeable ministers, who have gold stars in their eyes, and in this case they rush, as they say, as if to a buffet table. But do we have central authority or not? Could Nikolay Ivanovich and Boris Ivanovich Gostev have said: "No, there is no money. We are not going to print any more money"? I believe such a possibility existed.

In order to avoid a financial catastrophe, a financial crash, we need to cure our economy, and primarily to revitalize our financial system. This means levelling the market, balancing the supply of goods and monetary means, and primarily eliminating the budget deficit. Why is this so necessary for us? Primarily to raise the living standard of the people—workers, peasants, the intelligentsia, and pensioners. If today we created such a commodity situation in the country where a person could spend each ruble for what he wants, this would mean approximately a 1.5-time increase in the living standard for all categories of the population. Second, every ruble must finally begin to work in the economy, so that people would want to earn this ruble. And thirdly, we must create a situation in which the supply of goods exceeds the demand so as to put into effect all the incentives of the new economic system, and primarily such a stimulus as the competition of producers.

How can we achieve the treatment and revitalization of our financial system? As far as I understand, the government is placing all its hopes on the sharp growth of consumer goods production this year and in 1990. Without going into detail, I can only say that this envisioned growth is not enough. It will barely be enough to cover the growth of the monetary mass. Yet that huge amount of money which is not backed by commodity goods and which the population has accumulated cannot touch this growth in any way.

There is another proposal: To perform radical reform of consumer prices. It is correct in itself. Yet in the current situation, when the social situation is so tense, I believe that we cannot risk taking such a step for some time, at least until the market is saturated even to a slight degree. It is no accident that according to surveys, only one-third of the population favors the reform of retail prices, and only under the condition that the stores begin to stock everything.

There is one other desperate proposal. It is the proposal to confiscate excess money from the population. From this tribunal I would like to address Deputy Viktor Afanasyev, the editor in chief of PRAVDA. I would like to ask him and his editorial staff what they were thinking when they published Chekalin's article, in which PRAVDA openly calls for taking personal money away from the population. Truly no CIA, no class enemy, can bring us so much harm as we can do to ourselves through our own, we might say, imprudence. Such appeals during such a heated situation, when everything disappears from the store shelves, when people, sensing impending inflation, grab whatever they can—these mean throwing another bucket of oil into the fire and increasing the alarm. As if all these incidents with soap, with salt, and matches were not enough for us. To add to this, PRAVDA—the central organ (we might add, in spite of the assurances of the government)—fans the emotions of the people: Spend money before it turns into simple pieces of paper. And the very confiscation of money (I do not even take a moral side), what can it give under current conditions? It will plug the budget hole for 6 months or so, and then we will again return to things as they were before. Not to mention how this would undermine the attitude and trust of the people toward restructuring.

Thus, whether we want to or not, in the matter of revitalizing our financial situation we must resort to normal economic measures. Not to confiscation in one form or another, but specifically to the application of those commodity-monetary relations which we have today.

I will try to present, comrades, that program which seems realistic to me. If I take one or two extra minutes, please forgive me. I warn you from the start that many may not like this program, and that it will probably not gain the support of the government.

What measures seem necessary now? First of all, to return to normal trade in alcoholic beverages. We must stifle the bootleggers not with the militia (the militia is powerless here), but with economic measures. These bootleggers, first of all, have taken away state income, and, second, they are destroying the entire social stability of our society. I would like to turn here to the writer Vasiliy Belov. If I called him an ideologue of the mafia, of the black economy, of rampant speculation, he would probably be very offended. But in fact that is how it is. Today, even if we refer to the official publications, half of the alcoholic beverages in the country (you have this reference at hand, comrade deputies) are already produced by bootleggers. This is only from sugar, not counting the tomato paste, "taburetovka" [the cheapest, most inferior ingredients], various bug exterminating fluids containing alcohol, and everything else. Drinking has not declined. That is an illusion. And people generally do not drink because of price. They drink because of depression, because of lies, and because of nothing to do. Here we must seek methods of solving the problem rather than destroying one of the sources of commodity and budget equilibrium in the country. (Applause).

The second factor is equalizing the market situation. Today in our country, according to the evaluations of specialists, there is somewhere around R150 billion in "hot" money. This is money which is waiting for goods to appear on the market. These are not savings for the

future. Throw the goods on the store shelf, and this money will immediately jump out onto the market. To dislodge this R150 billion, we need approximately $15 billion worth of various imported consumer goods. Plus, for the next 2-3 years, while the economy is in such a state of imbalance, while there is a danger of collapse, we need artificial, I emphasize, artificial import on the order of $5-6 billion a year to maintain the commodity equilibrium. Where will we get this money? Yesterday we heard the very serious report by Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov that there is no money like this in the country. I dare to affirm that if we want to, this money can be found.

First of all, will the government ever seriously present our collective farm [kolkhoz] chairmen with the notion that if they submit grain and meat in excess of a certain customary level, they will be paid in currency, with the right to spend this currency wherever they like? (Applause). We might add that our people are humble. I am convinced that we do not have to pay them $200 per tonne. They will settle for 75, and will sell it at that price. This is the first source of a colossal savings in currency. Here is the second source: Year in and year out we have a carry-over reserve of uninstalled machinery and equipment which, if recalculated into dollars, is somewhere on the order of 10 billion. Perhaps we should stop the import of equipment for all of our gigantic projects for 5 or 10 years? (Applause).

The third source. Unfortunately, I am forced to use foreign statistics here, as we do not publish this information. We might ask: Has anyone ever thought how much our interests in Latin America cost us, for example? According to American professional estimates, it is $6-8 billion annually. A considerable part of this is in hard currency. And we do not know what a considerable part is for when we, for example, pay 400 percent for Cuban sugar (as compared with the world price), we pay this in hard currency. This source alone would be enough to keep the consumer market in equilibrium for those few years which we need to somehow get by and to truly embark upon the road to reform.

Finally, there are loans. Nikolay Ivanovich says that he does not want to leave any debts for his grandchildren. I can understand him, but nevertheless there is something provincial in this. Today the whole world borrows with one hand and repays with the other. Everyone lives, so to speak, on credit. And if we borrow a certain sum (less than that debt which today hangs over us, and again if we believe Western sources, the net debt hanging over us is somewhere on the order of $30 billion), nothing terrible will happen. How can we repay it? If we speak in business terms (any financier will understand me), the fact is that today no one repays debts. They do not have to repay them. They only have to maintain the interest payments, and in order to service the additionally borrowed money, any of the three sources which I have mentioned above would be sufficient. These, I repeat, are the reduction in imports of agricultural products, the reduction in the import of heavy equipment, and the reduction of our expenditures on international obligations.

Furthermore, if we are thinking about equalizing the market, we must make the decision to sell land or at least to give it on permanent lease to anyone who wants. This is a great source of extracting money. (Applause). We must make the decision not merely to talk about, but already to really sell apartments, to sell trucks, to sell tractors, to sell everything which is held in reserve. Let the government sell anything it can so as to somehow equalize the market. And finally, there is such a factor as stockholding, stocks and standard 30-year state loans at high interest. This would also paralyze a certain considerable portion of the unstable money held by the population.

Yet here is what else I would like to emphasize: Those funds which we can receive from increased import of consumer goods—this money should be destroyed, written off. Only in this case will we finally achieve a precedence of supply over demand on the market, which will allow us to change over to normal economic conditions and to normal competition. We can and must also extract excess money from the enterprises and also write it off and destroy it. By what means? By means of auctions. Go ahead, if you please, sell your automobile to your neighbor, if he wants, for 10 times the price. But you will then hand over half of this price to the budget, and the budget will destroy this money. And, of course, there are state loans: Empty money not secured by commodities which held by the enterprises may also be involved in the stable state structure, selling them obligations for long-term state loans at high interest.

We have already spoken here about the other sources of reducing our expenditures. Of course, we must reduce industrial capital investments. For example, yesterday I was glad to hear that, thank God, we will finally increase pensions. Yet does anyone even understand that if we stopped only one of the "projects of the century"—the Tyumen project—this money would be enough to increase pensions and to increase payments to all our underprivileged strata of the population already this year? And how many such "Tyumen projects" are we still realizing or just barely beginning to realize? We must understand that the state is bankrupt, that for the next 10 years there cannot be any "building of communism", that we can build only that which yields rapid comsumer effect. (Applause). No "building of communism"! (Applause). And I believe that the banks, through increased interest rates, must today also hold back the capital investments of enterprises.

Defense expenditures were also mentioned here. There is also one other factor—a very delicate one. I do not know if our farmers will support me or not. Of course, our agriculture needs additional injections of state funds. It needs support. Yet we have thought up the most ineffective, the most inept form of state aid to agriculture, where to one who works well we pay a ruble for a

kilogram of produce, but to one who is all thumbs we pay 2 rubles (Applause). We need to eliminate this. (Applause). And this expenditure is no joke. It comprises almost one-third of the state budget deficit. We must rid ourselves of this expenditure as soon as possible. I do not want to say that for 3 years, until we treat and revitalize our financial position, we must apply the brakes to economic reform. No, revitalization and reform must proceed in parallel. Yet today the most acute thing is not the future, but the present day. In connection with this, I am presenting several proposals.

First of all, it seems to me that the budget is such an important, acute matter that already in October or November, when we meet, the adoption of the budget must fall under the competency of the Congress of People's Deputies. (Applause).

The second thing. Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov promises to eliminate the budget deficit sometime in the mid-90's. I believe we can and must shorten this time. Of course, it would be unrealistic this year. Yet if we take Draconian, radical measures for next year, we can reduce the deficit at least to that level which was customary for us for 15 years—at least to R10-20 billion as opposed to that colossal level at which it stands today. Therefore, I am presenting the following proposal: To provide in the congress recommendations for eliminating or principally reducing the budget deficit not at the end of the next five- year plan, but in 1991.

Furthermore, in order for us to understand where we stand, what is happening to us, and in what position the state finds itself, I believe that it is absolutely necessary to make public the real scope of the state debt. For many years we have borrowed secretly from the public as well as from enterprises. The state debt is huge, but we do not admit it. We must know this picture, how much the state has collected, how much it owes the population today, including the deductions from the savings banks and the deductions from the enterprise savings funds. It is just as necessary to publicize our foreign debt and our balance of payments. Otherwise, we are just guessing, feeling out our way as we go, but not really knowing the real state of affairs.

Finally, the last thought, and on this I will conclude with my final proposal. The country's Central Bank cannot find itself in the position in which it exists today—in the role of a department of the Ministry of Finance or a department of the Council of Ministers. In the situation which has emerged, the Central Bank must take the entire problem of the issuance of money and inflation into its own hands. In all normal states the Central Bank is just as independent as the supreme court or the constitutional supervision. The president of the Central Bank should not be subordinate to anyone, including Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov. He must be subordinate only to the congress. (Applause). Thank you for your attention.

A.-M.K. Brazauskas: Kazimira Danute Prano Prunskene has the floor.

K.D.P. Prunskene, rector of the Institute for Advanced Training of Specialists in the National Economy under the Lithuanian SSR Council of Ministers (Shyaulyayskiy Territorial Electoral District, Lithuanian SSR): Honorable president! Honorable deputies! Many years of practical application of partial economic reforms have convincingly proven their inconsistency under conditions of super-centralized economic management of the great power which the Soviet Union has become. Revitalizing this gigantic economic organism, bringing it out of stagnation, or even overcoming its decline are becoming unthinkable under the old methods of long-distance management from a far-away great power center, regardless of how strong and even wise it may be.

The Baltic conception of economic reform is based on the principle of localizing the solution of problems, transferring [this problem solving] to that level where the economic and social processes are taking place, where there is real information and where these processes are implemented by interested people. We view the economic independence of the republics as the primary and necessary condition for reorganizing the economic management of individual republics as well as the Soviet Union as a whole. The need for this is determined by an entire series of circumstances.

First of all, decentralization and democratization of the economy can take place only in all of its cross-sections. This cannot be done selectively, such as by striving toward independence of enterprises while leaving the republics as a whole and their local Soviets without any rights. In that way the entire sense of the appeal—all power to the Soviets—is lost.

Second, the so-called unity of the national economic complex implemented at the will of the center and through it—and the results of this are well known to all—must be replaced by direct ties between the republics, and primarily their enterprises. Nothing unifies peoples and their economies more than the market.

Third, the economic development of any republic and region must consider the principle of regionalism—that is, the century of traditions in economic thought and motivation for actions of a specific people, the character of its interaction with a specific social and natural environment. Ignoring this fact and efforts to seek out and make unified decisions in the center inflicts a great and irreplaceable loss upon all the peoples of the union and tears out the natural roots of development and participation in international division of labor, with its own inimitable contribution. Is it not this that has led to the dying off of the Aral and to many other ecological catastrophes?

Fourth, restructuring may be implemented only by an interested person, and not simply by the work force or by an enterprise or department. In the production collectives this interest is one-sided. It does not encompass the ecological, socio-demographic, cultural, or national aspects of life which can and must be regulated within the framework of a socially visible territorial community. Such are the small republics which are capable of becomings masters of their own life and of responsibly directing their economic development for the good of man, the people of the republic and the Union as a whole.

Fifth. restructuring is proceeding an a non-uniform pace in the individual republics as well as in the regions. The readiness to change over to self government is also not uniform. This non-uniformity is natural, and it cannot be overlooked. We sense this also at the congress. Artificial inhibition of the processes of socio-political activity and economic enterprise leads to underutilization of the domestic potential of the republics and regions and gives nothing but loss—for each individual as well as for the entire Union. By marching in unison we can go only in the direction of downfall, and it is possible to untangle ourselves from the routine of stagnation only by developing initiative.

Sixth. The right of the republics to independently manage their economy is natural, as is the right of a people or a person to existence and self-determination. The actual absence of rights in the sphere of economics, and not only in this sphere, as well as in the question of the return of these rights is, in our opinion, the most sore and burning question. Even if we do not touch upon those specific circumstances which are associated with the deals made by Stalin and Hitler in regard to the Baltic. If we circumvent these rights, then democratization itself and the idea of a legal state and union become speculative.

And finally, in order to attract people to investing their labor and means to the individual peasant farm, even to leasing which has little prospect in the Baltic, or to stock acquisition and other forms of demonopolization of the economy, it is necessary to protect the rights of people and enterprises, to provide guarantees and instill trust in the laws. To restore the lost trust in the laws and in authority at the republic level is much easier than to do so on a Union scale. Today the Lithuanian peasant is ready to believe his deputies, but will he trust the voting of the congress? That is the big question. For now, we, too, will not be able to convince him without being hypocritical, since that which is obvious for most people in the Baltic is still unclear or unacceptable for many congress deputies from other republics. Yet can all the Lithuanian, Estonian, or any other people be wrong or irrationally emotional? And who can take upon himself the mission of evaluating this?

Let us speak briefly about the very content of economic independence as presented in the draft of the law submitted to the congress, which has already been handed out to the deputies. I will note: The law was developed on the basis of an integral conception. If we apply or extract only individual parts, then the mechanism simply will not work. According to the outline, it is within the jurisdiction of the republics to adopt legislative statutes on regulating the republic's economy and on ownership, application and management of state property in the republic. This means decentralization of state ownership itself. The republics are becoming full-fledged masters of their land, their underground resources, their forests and other resources which were created not only during the years of Soviet rule. Thus, they are finally attaining an ownership interest. The republic organs of state authority implement state regulation of all spheres, including the monetary-credit and finance system, the formulation of the republic's state budget and the local budgets, foreign economic activity, the determination of principles for labor wages, pensions, and stipends, the order of price formation, and the principles of economic activity of the enterprises, equal for all sectors including the cooperative, whose flaws are caused specifically by the economy itself and by the absence of a normal market.

One of the arguments presented by the center and other opponents of the idea of an independent republic is the fear that regional differences might intensify. It seems to me that it is better to live differently but well than all the same but poorly. (Applause).

We have already experienced levelling. It holds back not only those who are more developed, but also facilitates a continuation of the weaknesses of those who are lagging behind. Many deputies from the Baltic, to put it mildly, are surprised at Comrade Ryzhkov's repeated statements which cause unfriendliness toward us on the part of other republics. Supposedly more profitable conditions have been created for us and we, using the cheap raw material, are pocketing the end product and realizing a great profit. (Noise in the audience). According to unreliable price estimates, Lithuania is "sentenced" to a negative balance in inter-republic trade. It would seem we are becoming dependents. I cannot believe that the prime minister does not know the real state of affairs about who is ultimately pocketing the considerable profits from industry. After all, around 95 percent of the deductions from the profits of enterprises of union subordination are accumulated by the center. The prices on agricultural produce are extremely unprofitable, and Lithuania is obligated to supply almost half of [this produce] to the union funds. Is it not a paradox that the increase in deliveries to the union fund leads to an increase in the republic's debts to the union treasury, which are already approaching the billion mark? If we produced less, we would not have any debts. After all, it is not we, but the center itself which by the departmental method sets the prices, the state orders, limits and other instruments of economic management. If, for example, Lithuania underpays Uzbekistan or Tadzhikistan for cotton due to unsubstantiated prices, under economic independence the agreements would be made according

to mutually beneficial prices. And this would not lead to any isolation of the economy, as certain leaders fear. Rather, it would lead merely to correction of irrational, often distorted, structures and ties imposed by the center. Finally, integration will take on a natural basis.

We realize that under deficit conditions, a certain time will be needed to create an effective inter-republic market, under which there will no longer be a need for direct intrusion of the state into trade dealings between enterprises. Our conception provides for a transitional period of maintaining the inter-republic ties which have become established. They are to be implemented through mutually beneficial agreements and contracts between the individual republics, as well as between them and the union apparatus. Here, a portion of the specific interests of producers and consumers will be represented in the form of a summary order and supply by the republics for equivalent commodity exchange. In the transition of all republics and regions to self-management, the process of formulating independent, self-financing enterprises interacting on the union market will also be accelerated.

Economic independence of the republic is in no way combined either with the currently effective principle of formulating the Union state budget, or with the one proposed by the USSR Council of Ministers. The mutual relations must be structured as follows: The republic budget—the union budget, since the union unites not economic enterprises, but sovereign republics. They have the right to know and to jointly determine what kind of budget is needed, how we formulate it, how much we spend and for what, including also for the free-wheeling of the departmental bureaucratic apparatus, the super-needs of the Armed Forces, the conquest of space, etc. The poverty of the people obligates us to become prudently thrifty and to resolve budgetary questions—union as well as republic—at the will of the people.

The people of my republic, as well as many other peoples, are capable of creative building. They are industrious and aim toward a better life. They do not want to appropriate someone else's labor or live off of handouts from the center. And where does the center get this? We insist on the general principle: By working better, one should also have the right to live better. This is not an exceptional, but a common right of every people. Lack of recognition of this in regard to the people of Lithuanian or of any other republic is a departure from the most sacred thing that a person and a people have—the right to free self determination.

We have dared to express an initiative for transforming the Union from a supra-republic, republic-managing strong center into an alliance of sovereign republics with an inter-republic apparatus which represents their interests and which they themselves formulate. This relates also to economic relations within the Union. The wisdom and the democratizing, restructuring force of the center may be evaluated by whether it will be able to rise above the egotistic interests of self-preservation and aid in the process of democratization, or whether it intends to continue along the tradition of determining the fate of large and small peoples, and even their minor economic affairs.

Associated with this is the essence of the so-called Baltic problem, which even in the course of the congress inevitably spills over into the general problem of building the Union and its prospects. As yet, we have not seen any shifts in the direction of constructive solutions to the question of recognizing economic independence either in Comrade Ryzhkov's speech or in the actions of the government. Rather, they speak of increasing only certain rights for the republics, whose people have expressed their firm will in this regard. We cannot put off the resolution of this problem even as long as fall. The people cannot long be in a state of political tension building up due to the foot-dragging and hindrances of the center, which is acting under the aegis of defending the conquests of socialism and internationalism. We declare that the economic models developed by the Baltic republics are very close to the statements of Moscow scientists, and they contain much more socialism than we have today. The Baltic republics are ready to assume responsibility—and this responsibility is needed primarily before one's own people, and not before some autocratic center. They are ready, if you will, to become experimental, turning the economy onto the natural and sensible path of development. There is simply no other way out for us and, it seems to me, there is also no other way out for the center. Thank you. (Extensive applause).

From the audience: I propose that we give the floor to economists from the Moscow group, to economic leaders... (the rest is inaudible).

A.-M.K. Brazauskas: Well, it seems to me, comrades, that is how it is working out. Up to now, as you see, the speakers have been economists. I think that we are not straying too far from the line. As I have already said, Comrade Nazarov has the floor, and Comrade Yegorova should get ready.

I.A. Nazarov, first secretary of the CPSU Russko-Polyanskiy Raykom, Omsk Oblast, village of Russkaya Polyana (from the CPSU): Honorable deputies! Honorable members of the presidium! There are many problems today in our state and much to discuss at the congress, but I would once again like to focus your attention on rural problems. I believe that I am not exaggerating when I say that food provision is the most sensitive point of economic reform and all of restructuring. The strength of authority of the government, as well as yours and mine, will depend on how completely and quickly this problem is resolved. Yet my voters and I are concerned by the fact that many of the decisions on agriculture in recent years bear a declarative character. This, I believe, can explain the fact that the country's

agrarian sector has been marching in place, which gives reason for many publicists and agronomist-scientists to give a negative evaluation of the rural population. The reason for this, of course, may be the extended food crisis in the country. However, the main thing is that it characterizes the attitude of our society toward the peasantry.

Today it is quite the fashion to discuss and give advice on how to work the land. Even people who are not associated with agriculture do this, people who know the farm only from two or three trips which they have made there, or from folklore. Where does such disrespect toward the people come from? I would like to ask such people to stop and think about the fact that this is simply not ethical, and that in general agriculture is not such a simple matter as some may think. You must understand, the peasant has never had and still does not have the decisive word. There is always someone to decide for him. Today he is asking for respect and consideration.

I am often asked by machinery operators, livestock raisers, and workers: Why is it that, in preparing their decisions and in speaking of agriculture, the central organs are not interested in the opinion of the rural residents? Why is it that the fate of the farm is often decided without considering the opinions of people living on the farm? Perhaps this can explain the frequent changes in the signboards by organs of farm management which have taken place in the country in recent years? This causes mistrust and skepticism among the peasants. We must put an end to this practice.

Comrades! I support the appeal of the farmers to the congress, the speech by Comrade Starodubtsev. This is not a desire to open another discussion on agriculture, but a soulful cry for help, a demand for us to take a sober approach to the problems of the farm and to undertake them in priority order. (Applause).

I support the proposal to create a USSR Supreme Soviet Committee on agrarian questions and food products, and propose that we charge it with the responsibility of protecting the interests of the agrarian sector. Specifically, this would entail protection of agrarian interests against departments, against the bureaucracy, against ill-planned voluntaristic decisions, and finally against incompetent management. This committee must have broad powers.

I also propose that at the Fall meeting of the USSR Congress of People's Deputies we consider the information presented by the government regarding the realization of our proposals and statements.

The farm workers also do not quite understand the opinion formed today among the country's leadership that an adequate amount of resources has been invested into agriculture. However, if the acuteness in technical provision of the farm with modern machinery has not been removed, if many villages and entire regions have become depopulated, and this has taken place due to distortions in the social infrastructure, how can we speak of adequacy? People do not run from good to bad. I might suggest that any one of us sitting in this auditorium go to visit a farm village, and not to a model one, as if sometimes done. There we will see a picture of the 18th-19th centuries. The statistical growth of capital investments in the agrarian sector is due to the increase in the cost of construction, the cost of fertilizers and technology.

But what about the problem of the quality of technology? Seventeen years ago I came to the farm and encountered this problem, yet even to this very day the machine builders manufacture outdated and poor quality "products".

The level of mechanization is not increasing. Its current state is somewhere in the 1960's. But where is automation? Where is electronics? Could it be that this is why farm labor is not held in esteem?

Here is the next point. As far as I know, the agrarian sector of Siberia is a sizeable part of the country's agricultural complex both in volume and in level of intensity of its development. For example, Omsk Oblast not only supplies itself with food, but also makes food deliveries to over 50 points throughout the country. Practically over half of the produce raised here is sent outside the oblast. And this is in spite of the very high industrial potential of the city of Omsk itself.

However, we Siberians see that the attitude of the center toward the development of the Siberian region is not entirely fair. There is no real state policy, which leads here to a serious imbalance in the economy. As before, Siberia is the raw material appendage of the country. Social outlays, the low level of the labor wage, the extremely inadequate capital investments in the Siberian village, the Siberian climate—all these factors lead to a constant migration of the population, and this creates difficulties in organization of production.

Today, Siberia's agrarian sector needs principle sizeable capital investments, and primarily for social development, road construction, water supply, gasification, and heat supply. Near Tyumen there are huge reserves of natural gas which is burned off in torches, while we are forced to heat our houses with firewood. The lack of resolution of these and other questions may lead to depopulation of the Siberian village. We see the tendencies toward this even now. What if Siberia turns into a Non-Chernozem Zone, and then billions would have to be invested to resurrect it?

A specific discussion centers around the virgin lands region. After all, here for many years much was built on the enthusiasm of the people. Yet today a new generation has come, and it has begun demanding not an advance, not slogans, but a real improvement in the living standard. Is the return offered by the virgin lands great? Yes,

it is! Despite the fact that there are affirmations stating that it was supposedly a mistake to develop the virgin lands. Well, that is nothing new. Today we will hardly find a period in Soviet rule which has not been placed in doubt or some effort made to cross it out of history. The virgin Russko-Polyanskiy rayon alone supplies the state with 150,000-200,000 tonnes of grain a year, as well as 80 percent of the strong and hard wheat, 30,000 tonnes of milk, 5,000 tonnes of meat, and 200 tonnes of pure wool fiber.

There are many disagreements today about the forms of farm management. I believe that the March plenum of the party Central Committee acted wisely in adopting the decision on different forms of organization of agricultural production. The peasant will himself decide how he should work. Therefore, we do not quite understand the categorical demands for general farm leasing and for organization of peasant farms. And what should we do with the current specialized enterprises and regions where full specialization and concentration of production have been implemented, and which, we might add, yield good results?

For example, in this same Omsk Oblast, where all the sheep raising is concentrated at only 30 state farms [sovkhozes] and vegetable farming—at 5 sovkhozes, a few poultry farms provide for the oblast's needs and export meat and fowl outside the oblast. The same is true for hog raising and dairy farming. What should we do if the area of arable land in each sovkhoz of this same Russko-Polyanskiy rayon where I work comprises 30,000 hectares, while the size of a field is 400 hectares and the annual production is R8-9 million of agricultural produce?

Each sovkhoz is a highly organized socialist enterprise with a high level of social development and a stable labor collective. In speaking of leasing and of peasant farms, we do not always stop to think that an appropriate material-technical base and technical equipment are needed for this. To count on manual labor is to discredit ahead of time this important cause, which is the new form of farming. And if today the labor of the peasant is one of the most difficult forms of labor, then what will it be tomorrow?

I raise these questions not for the purpose of somehow showing my attitude and opinion on farm leasing. My opinion is synonymous: This is one of the effective methods of revitalizing work on the farm, particularly when a collective is the leaseholder. However, we cannot allow working in fits and starts or categorial refusals, as was the case in times that were not the best. Perhaps we will need more than one year for this. Well, that is still better than concluding the matter with nothing more than catchy slogans. The practice of emotional decisions rather than rational ones is still prevalent today.

We are also concerned by the fact that the prerequisites have been created for economic stifling of the sovkhozes and kolkhozes. There have already been cases of reduced investments into this sector. The changeover by the sovkhozes and kolkhozes to self financing, which we might add was voluntary, without any improvement in price formation and without bringing about order in the ties between the city and the farm, has already brought this decision to discreditation, turning it, as they say, to false self-financing.

I would also like to address the people engaged in the governmental development of agrarian policy. Why is it that today we have so readily accepted independence for the leaseholder and the co-operator? This is good. We need this. But we still do not trust the socialist enterprise's labor collective, its council or its manager. (Applause).

Despite the numerous discussions and decisions, there is no local economic independence, and I can testify to this from my own practical experience. How long will this continue? How many more breakthroughs and revolutions do we need?

I had occasion to hear the speech of Comrade Murakhovskiy. At times he would say with indignation that, supposedly, the central departments do not interfere in local matters. Full independence has been granted. The criticism addressed at [these central departments] is not objective and, supposedly, the fault lies with the local sites. This prompted me to ask the question which has no answer: Either this is a matter of not knowing the state of affairs or a desire to lead us, mildly speaking, into confusion? Why do we not tear down the system of general mistrust and irresponsibility formulated within our society? How long will we build our case only on personalities, and not on systems? After all, just take a look. Leading agrarian practice is upheld by such pillars as Comrades Vagin, Starodubtsev, Veprev, and many others. And, luckily, it is good that there are many such people in the country and that they, as far as I know, are primarily distinguished by courage and firm will in standing up for their views. Yet where will we find enough such Starodubtsevs for the entire country? We need a system of economic management, and primarily economic independence in deed, which will undoubtedly be accompanied by the highest responsibility of the cadres.

I am in favor of regional cost accounting and local self government, and of the centralization of economic management, but only under the condition of centralized political management. This ultimately will allow people to manifest their abilities and to see who is capable of doing what. After all, everyone is tired of always being the eccentric!

Comrades! The voters have asked me also to convey their concern regarding the deterioration of labor and social discipline in the country and the removal of the

anti-alcohol policy. For some people the words "discipline", "order", and "organization" are for some reason associated with the word "Stalinism". This is a misconception, and one which we do not understand. After all, any civilized society has inherent organization and conscious discipline. Otherwise, it is but a stone's throw away from anarchy. The process of democracy in the country is irreversible, but this process must be accompanied by organization and order. Those people for whom the word "discipline" causes an allergic reaction evidently never go to the labor collectives and do not see the laxness and irresponsibility which reign in many places. And for the present day the saying that we do not know how to work has become widespread. No, we do know how to work! It is just that we no longer want to work well.

I believe that the Soviet people will view with satisfaction that part of the speech which discussed pension provision. It is a very complex problem, but it must be resolved at any cost, sparing no money for this cause, and perhaps even to the detriment of certain other programs. This will significantly revitalize the moral atmosphere in the country. I say this because recently, more precisely in the past few days, we have received numerous telegrams and phone calls in which the people demand that we solve the problem of pension provision at this congress once and for all.

An entirely correct decision has been made in the country regarding social re-orientation of the economy. The people perceived this with satisfaction, but are beginning to be concerned by the absence of any real change in the state of affairs in this sphere, and this is inadmissible under the current tense situation in society.

It seems to me that today the question of fulfillment must be a very important one. We have learned so well to write decisions and orders (there are very many such documents), that we have forgotten entirely that these decisions must also be implemented. And it is especially bad when one cannot even find the creators of these documents.

It has become the rule in recent times to print memoirs in journals and newspapers some 20-30 years after the fact, to tell about how certain decisions were made at one time. Today we must all know who stands at the source of the decisions which are being made. This practice of management has become particularly widespread in the last decade.

The people are concerned with the possibility of realizing the program for housing construction to the year 2000, as well as the program for paved roads, since the resolution of the food program has dragged on since 1982. We need an all-people's referendum on developing the programs, and all-people's control of their implementation.

Comrades! The work of the congress has shifted into a constructive vein. The haste of the first few days is over. The Soviet people and the country's leaders have evidently become convinced that our USSR Congress of People's Deputies, the present membership of people's deputies, is capable of specific action, and is capable of imposing strict demands. We would like to believe that we all stand on one platform and have one goal, even though each one of us may have different tactical means of achieving this goal. This is the essence of each person's participation in restructuring.

The congress will be evaluated not only by political scientists, but primarily by all the people. The evaluation cannot be given according to specific decisions and specific results. Unfortunately, we have spent a long time formulating a society of general fault-finding, and at the same time general irresponsibility. For many years we have placed the blame on tsarism. Today we place it on the years of stagnation. Yet each one of us should simply answer for his own deeds. I believe that the decisions of the congress will give all of us new strength and decisiveness in overcoming those difficulties which arise in the path of restructuring.

Finally, the demands of most of my comrades from the Omsk delegation, as well as numerous telephone conversations and telegrams, obligate me to announce the following. In his speech from this podium, one of our honorable comrades spoke of the nondemocratic nature of nominating members of our Omsk delegation to the membership of the Supreme Soviet. I understand that this was one of the attempts to confuse the congress and to sidetrack it. Therefore, I must explain that the elections in our delegation were held by secret ballot, on an alternative basis. And if someone's wishes were not fulfilled, then that is an entirely different matter.

Thank you for your attention. (Applause).

A.-M.K. Brazauskas: Yegorova has the floor. Comrade Yemelyanov should get ready.

I.A. Yegorova, section head at the Altay Kray Clinical Hospital, city of Barnaul (from the women's councils united by the Committee of Soviet Women): Honorable chairman! Honorable comrades! We have come to the congress with our own concerns and with the concerns of our fellow citizens and colleagues. Perhaps I will be redundant on a number of problems, but I cannot help but express my point of view.

As you know, the solution of many social problems depends on the socio- economic capacities of the region. Altay Kray is one of the most important support bases for the national economic assimilation of the eastern rayons of the country. The kray's agriculture is also of all-union significance. Nevertheless, the methods of planning the development of the social sphere ("from what has been formed") do not correspond to the peculiarities of the region. The kray is huge in its territory,

has a low population density and a weakly developed infrastructure. There is an acute problem with the farms, especially the small ones. It requires comprehensive solution. In many ways, credits would help in solving this problem, but unfortunately there are not enough of them.

I would like to express from this podium the desire of our Altay delegation and the Belorussian delegation that we need to raise society's respect toward bread. We probably all remember the words to the song which goes: "Son, remember the golden words—bread is the head of everything". At the present time, unfortunately, we do not have the proper respect for bread. This, our dear, golden bread, is being frittered away too easily. We must finally raise the prestige and the price of bread.

Comrades! To this very day, Siberia, including the Altay, is viewed by some as a colony, the private domain of the departments. Who, for example, can tell us why Siberian gas goes to the European part of the country and to the West, but in practice is little used in Siberia? Yet its use would play a great economic and socio-ecological role in the lives of Siberians. For example, we in Altay are offered gas in exchange for supporting the construction of the nitrogen mineral fertilizer plant in the city of Zarinsk, which already lives in difficult ecological conditions due to the presence of a coke chemical plant there. We cannot help but ask the question: Should we build new plants for the production of mineral fertilizers if, as we know, the plants which already exist in the country are not working to their full capacity? With such an attitude of the departments, we will not be able to raise the social sphere not only in Altay Kray, but probably in the entire Siberian region. The time has come to hand over all the funds for disposition by the local Soviets. Today it is no secret to anyone that the local Soviets do not have sufficient economic capacities in their command to be the sole masters of their territory. The Soviets still act in the role of petitioners of the enterprises located on their territory.

Today there are enterprises of over 50 ministries operating on the territory of the kray, and there is friction with each of them during allocation of funds for the kray's integrated development, particularly for the development of the social sphere. The centralized management of resources has taken on such a scope that it is not accessible either to deputy control or to the community. We must provide a mechanism of independence of the local Soviet in the form of a law on local self-government. However, the existing legal draft on local self-government must be reworked in detail. A certain percentage of the monetary funds of the enterprises must be deducted for the local Soviets' fund. The expenditure of these funds must be conducted openly and publicly. First and foremost, the efforts and means must of course be directed toward satisfying the needs of man.

As a doctor, let me deal with several problems in public health. As we know, this sector does not receive significant development. For example, the people's deputies from Altay were given 35 mandates on public health—more than on any other direction. We must radically change the strategy and tactics of planning the development of public health, and we must also change our approach to planning methods. The basic principle must be the quality of life or health in the full sense of the word, referring to the state of total physical, spiritual and social well-being.

Today we cannot be satisfied with approaches to public health planning without consideration for the environment in which we live, the culture, the entire social infrastructure of the region, as well as the material-technical base of public health. The growth of expenditures for public health is within the limits of 1.5 percent—from 3.2 to 4.7 percent of the gross national product, as planned according to the basic principles. This is clearly insufficient. In the developed countries this indicator equals 8-12 percent. We were glad to hear in N.I. Ryzhkov's speech that there are plans to transfer the public health budget over to the level of the republic and the region. This will allow the local organs to themselves maneuver their own forces and funds. However, the per capita indicator remains different for different regions, and does not consider their peculiarities. For example, in Altay 88 percent of the rural hospitals have outdated facilities and are housed in make-shift buildings without water supply or sewer lines, not to mention hot water. We cannot make do with the financial norms for maintaining these buildings, and we are always having to take funds from the article entitled "capital repairs".

Despite the government resolution, we do not have a full wage fund in accordance with the staff roster. This fund comprises 82 percent of that which is required. This ties the hands of the doctors and inhibits the development of new services.

Restructuring in public health is taking very timid steps. No clear mechanism of economic management has been developed. The experiment being conducted in a number of oblasts is not entirely satisfactory. In essence, only medical workers are participating in it, while the health of the people depends not only on us, but on the conditions of work, every-day life, and the environment—that is, on the entire living environment and on the quality of life. It should become profitable for an enterprise to have a healthy worker. After all, today it is no secret to anyone that the sick leave rolls are paid out not from the profits of the enterprises, but from the social security funds, from the social funds. Therefore, a paradoxical situation arises: The more sick people there are, the greater the savings for the wage fund. Only when the labor collective will itself pay for a worker who has gotten sick will the capacities and funds be found for improving labor conditions and everyday production conditions. (Applause).

We must also interest every citizen in caring for his own health. We do not have a health cult. We must pay for

maintaining health, then everyone will think: Should he run for a bottle of vodka, or should he run to the stadium?

Despite the fact that the prestige of medical workers has recently been on the upswing and allocations are increasing, there has been no significant improvement in health treatment or in the quality of mercy. The reason for this, in my opinion, is the absence of incentive motives. The wages of medical workers remain low, particularly those of the large army of therapists. The wages of nurses and medical assistants are extremely low. These young girls receive a wage which borders on the poverty level. We have not worked out sufficiently clear criteria for evaluating the quality of a doctor's work. One can do nothing and receive his wages, or one can work well and still receive the same money. Therefore, comrades, we must finally approach the economic levers for evaluating the activity of the entire medical service.

Here is the next question. We should think about reducing the doctor's work load and providing him with technical support. First of all, the following question demands solution. Today many kolkhozes and sovkhozes are able to buy a car for their medical-obstetrics stations. However, the existing resolution prohibits them from doing so. Yet these cars are obtained primarily to give first aid to the village residents themselves. I think that this limitation must be removed.

I will express some very serious pretensions to the GiproNIIzdrav [State Planning and Scientific-Research Institute for Planning Public Health Institutions]. We have no current projects for hospitals at the kray or village levels. How long will we have to coordinate with the ministries how and what we can build? If a hospital costs 5 million, then we can build it at the expense of the local budget, and everything over this cost must be approved. So we build a hospital without a polyclinic, without domestic services, and then we must once again eek out money for all of this. We build a dormitory, and then we re-classify it as a hospital or polyclinic, pretending that nothing is happening. Comrades, whom are we fooling? Do we really have to coordinate with Moscow something, for example, that we must build in Barnaul?

I am a surgeon, comrades, and today I am afraid to stand at the operating table, not having sufficient support. I am afraid for the patient because we do not have the most necessary things. Why is this? Why, it is because the average annual growth rate for a number of medicines in the past 3 years have not increased but, unfortunately, have declined. We can feel all of this ourselves. Therefore, I propose that we specify a group of medicinal preparations, such that a person cannot live without today. This is insulin, derivatives, hormonal preparations, heart medications, and a number of others—15-20-30 titles. If a billion is needed for them, then let us vote today and grant it. We will agree to live today without prestigeous machines, without consumer goods, just so we can have these necessary medications.

Dear enterprise managers, people's deputies sitting in this auditorium, and those who, perhaps, are hearing us today on television, those who have currency funds! I appeal to you: Let us allocate part of these currency funds for buying much-needed medications. Because it is simply criminal not to have the most necessary medicines. In this case, all the preparations purchased abroad must be placed under public control. Their import must be publicized in the press, and their expenditure must be publicly known. At the same time, I would like to reprimand our medical industry. We export abroad very much raw material for medicine production. It is time we started to manufacture these medicines ourselves. I am speaking specifically about insulin, which could probably be produced here at home, as well as about trenthal, for whose manuifacture we also export raw material abroad.

The debates go on: Should we or should we not include medicines and instruments as consumer goods. I believe that everyone must include this in his conscience. We say that the dearest thing a person has is his life and his health. Therefore, the Council of Ministers must find the wherewithall to give the green light to whatever public health needs. Thus, we must avoid the situation whereby the Council of Ministers decides in December of 1988 to include medicines in the list of consumer goods, while the Gosplan [State Planning Committee] leaves in this section only the ready-made forms. It is unclear who manages whom.

And in general, how long will the sub-legal statutes of the departments negate the laws adopted by the Supreme Soviet? We will never achieve order in the country that way!

Comrades! Here is what disturbs us. Why is it that our group interests have in many cases been placed above our state interests? Some, covering themselves with the decision of the labor collective, refuse to manufacture cheap instruments. Others, in their race for currency, take raw materials abroad instead of developing production at home. Yet all of us together are supposedly fighting for restructuring. Maybe we have had enough of engaging in empty words? Let us do our deed, each in his own place and all together! We must demand from the government, the Minmedbioprom [Ministry of the Medical and Microbiological Industry], Minpribor [Ministry of Instrument Marking, Automation Equipment, and Control Systems] that they resolve the questions on the need for increasing the medicines and medical technology in our country, and also recommend to the Russian Federation Minzdrav [Ministry of Health] that it take control of the distribution of imported equipment which is in short supply.

Comrade deputies! We cannot speak of the success of our society if we do not have a respectful attitude toward women and motherhood. Why does society forget that the woman bears the burden of reproducing mankind, a burden which can and must be eased by preventative health and social measures? Equal rights certainly do not presuppose carrying equal physical burdens. We have thrown the woman into the crucible of the labor front. We are the only country in the world where there are more women than men working in the national economy. In our country the woman is not protected by law against the violation of her guaranteed rights. For example, can a woman plan her family? No, and no again. After all, these are not merely contraceptives that we are talking about. This is primarily the quality of life. It is an apartment which she will have to wait almost to retirement to receive. It is kindergartens and nursery schools. It is the patching of holes in the family budget. To create and preserve a family, and then also to give birth to three to four children—that requires extreme bravery on the part of a woman. (Applause).

We have spoken much about the benefits for our women. We have spoken, but not acted. Dear comrades, is this not why our socialist countries and other countries of the world live better than us, because they care more about their citizens? Let us think about this. It is clear that today we cannot exclude women from the sphere of material production. However, we can and must take them out of the night shifts and the hazardous shops. We cannot long put off the concern for the health and for the working and everyday living conditions of women. Today more than ever before, the state needs healthy women. It needs strong and stable families. (Applause).

I would also like to mention the following. Today all the ills of modern production affect primarily women. They, especially the ones with many children, are the first to be dismissed from work. They become unprofitable for the enterprises, since they cannot always work with full return. Therefore, it is necessary to increase the social protection of women. We need a social protection fund. I propose that we create such a fund. If a woman cannot devote herself entirely to work, then the enterprise should receive a certain sum from this fund. This will allow the woman to work in peace, without inflicting a loss upon the enterprise. It is very easy to put [a worker] out the door. If we are building a humanistic society, then let us show some humanity toward our women. Let us show some concern for the woman. This will speak of the culture of our society. As yet, unfortunately, we still have a shortage of such culture! I support the proposal to create government-level departments or sectors for protecting the rights and the social position of women. (Applause).

Comrade deputies! In the kray, as well as in the country, an unfavorable ecological situation is being formulated which is having an ever more negative effect on the health of our generations. We will never achieve success in preventing illnesses if we do not stop environmental pollution. We cannot continue to risk our health and our future for the sake of the immediate interests of production and localism. We must ensure full openness regarding environmental questions! People have the right to know what they are breathing and what they are eating. We have spoken for many years about the pollution of food products with pesticides. Today we are throwing out tens of thousands of tonnes of vegetables and fruits which have an increased nitrate content. Our country still has no conception of the study, prediction and control of the consequences of environmental pollution as related to the health status of the people. Yet today such a program is becoming a vital necessity.

Dear comrades, for a number of years the passions have flared around the Katun GES [hydroelectrical station]. Yet no one will make a final decision, either in Altay kray or in the government. The representatives from the Baltic have spoken from this podium about the Katun GES. The honorable Comrade Rasputin has spoken. Only our dear fellow countrymen, the Gorno-Altay residents themselves, have not yet had a chance to speak. Therefore, I have a request for the presidium: To give the floor today to the representatives of the Gorno- Altay Autonomous Oblast. Today it is absolutely necessary to solve the problem of providing power to Gorniy Altay. People cannot continue to live in indeterminacy, because this indeterminacy has inhibited the development of many social spheres in Gorniy Altay.

And finally, here is the last proposal which I would like to express. At the pre-electoral meetings, many voters raised the question of closing the nuclear test site in Semipalatinsk. We cannot ignore public opinion and the protests by the population of this huge region. We must respond to the voters when we return home and tell them what we decided here at the congress. They are awaiting our positive decision. We must stop all nuclear tests in Semipalatinsk! Thank you. (Applause).

A.-M.K. Brazauskas: Comrades, Deputy Yemelyanov has the floor. Comrade Gayer should get ready. We are receiving notes whose authors ask that we read a list of those comrades who will speak. Before 1400, I believe, six people will be able to speak, in addition to those previously announced. Yet, this is a preliminary list. In order, they are: Comrades Gumbaridze, Yablokov, Chebanov, Zalygin, Gvozdev, and Suleymenov. That is how many will speak before 1400.... Attention, comrades, we give the floor to Aleksey Mikhaylovich Yemelyanov.

A.M. Yemelyanov, head of the department of agricultural economics, M.V. Lomonosov MGU [Moscow State University] (Lenin Territorial Electoral District, Moscow, Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR]): Comrade deputies! Honorable voters, who tie your last vital hopes to our congress! Our congress will largely determine the fate of restructuring and the fate of the entire country. Restructuring has currently come to its critical point. Four years has not produced any improvement in the real living conditions of the population. In

the recent period, a number of negative tendencies in the democratization of society have become apparent. The situation today generally stands as follows: Either we continue along the path of revolutionary democratic renovation of society, or a movement will begin along a new turn, which is well known to us from the past, and with its inevitable period of reactionary vengeance.

Of course, it would be incorrect to place the blame for the difficulties which have arisen on the current leadership alone. The legacy which we have inherited is too heavy. The abyss in which we have found ourselves is too great. Yet for the sake of objectivity we must say that the current difficulties are largely explained by inconsistencies in policy. We talk a lot about the new thinking. Yet it seems that we have really applied it only in foreign policy, where we have seen real results. As for the development of the economy and the social sphere, here the former approaches still prevail, the movement from what has been achieved, stop-gap measures, and therefore we have no real results. Nikolay Petrovich Shmelev has already presented specific examples of this. I would like to present one or two from the agrarian sphere. Really, why is that that every year we find huge resources, both currency and natural resources, for buying up large amounts of bread and meat, and why are there no such resources for reducing the losses of crops which we ourselves raise? Why do we have enough oil to buy grain, but when it comes time for harvest the combines and trucks stand idle because we have used up our limits of fuel? (Applause). What kind of a policy do we need here? These are questions which the rank-and-file worker, the rank-and-file peasant, would surely resolve if he were in charge. Yet they are beyond the comprehension of our high-ranking bureaucrats.

The main thing, perhaps, is that in recent years, in the 4 years of restructuring, we have made very little progress in resolving the basic question—the formulation of the political system, the political mechanism which would truly make the people the masters of the country. And it is clear that if the people were the masters, we would never have found ourselves in our current position. Today, unfortunately, the tendency is such that the farther up you go from the people, the more evident the extinguishing of democratic principles becomes. This, specifically, is understandable. Our restructuring (the initiators of restructuring and the Politburo have long ago stated this in their documents) is a revolution, and any revolution is a radical change in power—that is, a struggle for power. Yet history teaches us that the ruling class, the ruling elite, has never voluntarily or enthusiastically given up its power. Our 4 years of restructuring are a clear confirmation of this fact.

The administrative-bureaucratic apparatus at all levels, especially at the upper echelons of power, has set up its defense perimeters and is doing everything possible to preserve its monopolistic position, in which it holds only rights and no responsibilities, in which it determines everything, decides everything, and yet bears no responsibility for the consequences of its decisions (applause). Rather, it passes down these consequences onto the lower segments, and ultimately onto the people. I can imagine how difficult it is for the initiators of restructuring, for the secretary general and for other democratically minded leaders in the upper echelons of power, to more or less consistently implement the idea of restructuring and the idea of democratic renovation of our society.

Specifically, today we speak much about the independence of the lower levels and the enterprises. Yet it is elementally clear: It is impossible to accomplish this without limiting the functions of the upper levels. The wolves cannot be satisfied if the sheep are safe. Yet look at what is happening. There are plenty of models for cost accounting, but only a handful of enterprises get more or less real cost accounting independence. Just stop and think—which enterprises are these? They are those enterprises which can reliably prove that they are not only unprofitable, but that they are dying, that they have one foot in the grave. Only then do the bureaucrats meet, discuss the matter, and give some of these enterprises relatively complete cost accounting independence. Yet as long as they are still breathing, we let our ironclad state bureaucratic mechanism bring them to their deathbed. Yet why not take measures in time? What kind of science can compensate for these elementary absurdities? We must, and I believe that we can and should long ago have done this, extend to the state enterprises those elementary principles which have justified themselves in cooperative management: interest and independence. These are not purely cooperative principles. Rather, they are principles of elementary normal economic management, and they must exist at any state enterprise. (Applause).

We can understand why this is not done. If such independence were given to all state enterprises, then the superfluousness of our entire huge bureaucratic superstructure would immediately become apparent. And who wants to sign their own death sentence? I believe that we must radically change the principles of the management system's approach to restructuring. We must proceed not from the top down. We must engage not in the changing of signboards, not in stop-gap measures or in repainting of facades. Rather, we must proceed from the bottom up. At each management level there must be only those organs of management, with those functions and with that number of employees in the apparatus as are necessary to the lower levels. The existence of any management organ is justified only if the need for it is dictated from below by the interests of production development. (Applause).

Such a principle, in my opinion, is contained, although timidly, in the appeal of farmers, in the appeal which reflects the pain and soulful cries of our peasantry. I believe that this principle should perhaps be introduced not only into economic management, but also into the

system of party leadership. Then we will be able to place the management pyramid in our country on a sound footing, when the entire management apparatus will be at the service of the people, and not the people at the service of the apparatus, as is in fact the case today. (Applause).

The tenacity of the administrative-bureaucratic system and apparatus is largely fed by the existence of social privileges in the distribution of material and spiritual benefits. This question is not new, and it has arisen also at our congress. I cannot deal in detail with this question. However, I would like to stress the following: When certain leaders tell us that these privileges supposedly do not exist, translated into simple everyday language this means only one thing. It means they think that all the people live as they do and are provided for as they are. How can we think of politics, and what can we expect? We spoke here about creating a commission on this matter. I do not oppose a commission, comrades, but commissions have one major characteristic—to drag out the solution of any question. I propose that our congress include in its resolution a categorical, unequivocal decision on eliminating these privileges in principle. And the commission could then determine the specific mechanism for realizing these principles adopted by the congress. (Applause).

Within the framework of this major problem, I would like to stress one specific question, which nevertheless is of general importance. I am a deputy from the Lenin electoral district of the capital city, including the Leninskiy and Kievskiy rayons. Not many Moscow residents, and moreover non-Moscow residents, know that 40-60 percent of the residents of the capital's historical center live in communal flats. They were born here and here they are living out their days. However, when it comes time for them to get an apartment, they are offered one in the outlying rayons of the capital. Meanwhile, comfortable houses for the Council of Ministers, the Central Committee, and other high-ranking departments are erected here. This is not only ignoring the interests of the pupulation, but, I believe, a direct challenge to the people. And I, as a deputy, am relaying a persistent demand, and not simply a request (our people are tired of acting in the role of beggars before the leaders). I am relaying the persistent demand of the voters that those houses which are today in various stages of progress toward completion do not go to those for whom they were intended, but rather to the residents of this microrayon. (Applause).

In principle we must strive to see that under the order of self- government, not one department has the right to do something on the territory of a given rayon or a given area without coordinating its actions with the residents of this rayon and without their agreement. Otherwise there can be no self-government.

I fully support the proposals expressed here regarding the provision for socially unprotected strata of the population. I would only like to emphasize that to this group we should also add the students, since their stipends, like the pensions of pensioners, have lost their value under conditions of runaway inflation, and do not provide for an elementary existence. (Applause).

There are many economic and social questions. However, their resolution has its roots in the formulation of a democratic political system. Things for us have not always been bad. There have been certain rays of light between the cults after the change of the country's head political leader—the secretary general. This period was approximately 1953-1957, as well as the 8th 5-Year Plan (1966-1970). But why later, after 4, 5, 6 years, did the economy and the social sphere go downhill?

Primarily because the political mechanism was changing. From a relative democracy and collective management we went to a regime of personal power, to authoritarian rule. We had no political defense mechanism for the democratic life of the country. And as long as we have no such mechanism, we still, even now, do not have any guarantees of the irreversibility of restructuring. Therefore, the formulation of such a mechanism is our number one task. (Applause).

Today we often stress the fact that the party itself is the guarantor of the irreversibility of restructuring. Allow me to doubt this principle. We have always had the party, but all the same we have reached our current state. Strictly speaking, it is not the people themselves who have come to the current crisis situation. They have come to it led by the party, often forced to realize its course. We must take this into consideration if we are to soberly evaluate the past and draw from it lessons for the present and for the future. The one-party system also presupposes one-party responsibility. We have already made considerable steps in formulating the new political mechanism. What more must we do? The first question is the delimination of functions of state and party power and from this—dual office holding. Comrades, we must not adapt the system to a certain leader, but rather we must integrate the leader into a system based on democratic principles. The principles here are as follows: The one-party system—already there is monopolization of power, and if the leader of the single party is also the president—this is monopolization of power squared. And if for now we must temporarily have such dual office holding (and I understand why, because transferring power from the party to the people is a very difficult and long drawn out process), then we should not present this temporary combination of duties as a principle of socialism. We must specify this in the congress documents and each time return to the resolution of this question. Who then, you might say, will head up the party? What kind of a party do we have, if we reduce everything to one leader? And then, if there is no such leader in the Politburo, we must look farther. And in principle, what kind of a system is this, what kind of a mechanism is it when we do not know the members of the Politburo very well? After all, they have almost the

same political face. They often express the same ideas, and sometimes even in the same words. Under Lenin it was not like that. We must put an end to this, too. (Applause).

As for the combination of party and state power at the lower segments, we must firmly secure the inadmissability of such combination in the resolutions of our congress. Otherwise there will be an even more unforeseen monopolization of power. (Applause).

Here is the next question. We must approach the upcoming elections to the republic and local Soviets with a more well-developed system.

First of all, the elections of all deputies must be equal.

Second, we must not permit an unopposed candidate to appear on the ballot, since this is a loophole for easily promoting a number of functionaries to the position of deputy.

Third, we must be ready to change over in the future to electing the president by direct vote, by all the people on a competitive alternative basis. I fully support the proposal which was presented here regarding the direct election of the editor-ion-chief of the newspaper IZVESTIYA and the chairman of Goskomteleradio [State Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting]. I support the proposal to publish the book "Pamyat" [Memory], in which we can record the names of all those who died in Afghanistan. Yet in addition I would say that we must record there also the names of those who made the decisions on Afghanistan and specify who voted on this question and how. (Applause). It seems that this question has somehow been extinguished. The voters ask, as they asked me yesterday evening, why no commission on Afghanistan has been created, and the question has been hushed up.

Finally, the transition to true people's power largely changes the position of the party in our social and political system. Let me explain. Honorable party and political leaders, let us perceive all this correctly. Otherwise, any effort to formulate this question is already evaluated (as resounded also at the congress) almost as an attempt to drive a wedge between the party and the people, to reduce the authority of the party. No, this is not the case. Of course, the authority of the party has declined. That is a fact. But it has declined primarily as a result of the party's activity during the past period. And we must say directly that even now the democratization of the intra-party life lags behind the democratization of society. It is expressed in the party elections (I am referring to 100 for 100). It is the directives about which much has been said here. It is the decision of the March plenum regarding Comrade Yeltsin, a decision under whose aegis the last stage of the election campaign in Moscow was run, and evidently not only in Moscow. The people have given their evaluation of this decision, specifically, also through their meetings. It is just too bad that the members of the Politburo and the members of the Central Committee did not come to these people's meetings, bringing with them the leading, in their opinion, representative of the working class, Comrade Tikhomirov. So that, as was done in Lenin's time, they could themselves explain to the people the essence of their decisions, and not push this task off onto the raykoms and the lower-level party organizations. (Applause).

In conclusion I would once again like to stress the main idea. As long as we are moving toward people's power (and this is the basic content of restructuring), then we must redefine the place of the party in the social structures. The voters present the problem: What can you, the deputies, do? Almost all of you communists and the Central Committee will make a decision, and you will have to vote according to the party Charter, and all our will of the people will be extinguished. This question is repeated at almost all the meetings. I believe that this stems from former notions, when the party held undivided power, and the people were essentially deprived of it. Yet now the situation is drastically changing in connection with the transfer of power to the Soviets. The people stand above the party. Our congress stands above the party congress. The Supreme Soviet stands above the party Central Committee, and the constitution stands above the party charter. The party functions within the framework of the constitution developed by the people's representatives. And this determines our priorities. Each of us is first of all a deputy, and then a party member. And this must determine his behavior. Such a relation of party and people's organs must find its reflection in the USSR Constitution, the party charter, and in the documents of our congress. (Applause).

We must express the priorities which we have presented in everything, including also in the ranking of the organs in various documents. As it is, yesterday the voters presented me with the following question: "Why is it that in a recent information bulletin the Central Committee is listed first, and then the Supreme Soviet?" This also stems from the past. Here too we must change the stereotypes which have already been created.

In conclusion, I would like to say: Comrades, you and I are living in such a time of restructuring when objectively, and I stress, objectively all the roads lead to true people's power. We must do everything possible to remove any obstacles from this path, no matter who has placed them there.... Only then will we be able to use that last chance which history has given us for rehabilitation before our people and before the world community. We will not have another such possibility. Thank you for your attention. (Applause).

A.-M.K. Brazauskas: Attention, comrades! We are continuing the discussion. Comrade Gayer has the floor. Comrade Gumbaridze will speak after the recess.

Ye.A. Gayer, scientific associate of the USSR Academy of Sciences Far East Department Institute of History, Archaeology and Ethnography, Vladivostok (Far Eastern National-Territorial Electoral District, RSFSR): Honorable Chairman! Honorable deputies! Many of you are probably thinking: Why is this woman so eager to get up to the podium? The fact is not so much that I personally wanted to have the floor, but that thousands of my fellow countrymen from the Far East and the native peoples of the Far East tie their hopes for success of restructuring with my presentation at this congress. They are the Nanay, the Ulchi, the Nivkhi, the Vegidaltsy, Orochi, Oroki, Udegey, and others—even the names of these peoples some of you, perhaps, are hearing for the first time. I understand that it is very difficult to be the last speaker before the recess. But I hope that you will have patience and will listen to what I have to say.

Seeing me off to the congress, the people who for 70 years of Soviet rule have never had the chance to speak in full voice about their rights said: Be sure that you get to speak, and tell them about everything that has troubled us all these years, and that for us is most important! So tell me, please, how can I not justify their hopes?! Therefore, honorable chairman and honorable deputies, forgive me for such fervor, which perhaps has been manifested in the preceding days.

We have become accustomed to always speaking about our achievements and our victories. I believe today is not the time to talk about this. We know about our victories and achievements. Today I would like to tell about the problems which affect our peoples. It so happens that the epicenter of public interest toward the problems of national relations has been shifted in the direction of the Transcaucasus and our Baltic republics. On the background of general international conflicts in these regions, the problems of those Soviet peoples which we traditionally call the peoples of the Far East and the Far North remain almost unnoticed.

No, they cannot organize mass meetings and demonstrations today. I believe there is no need for this. But does this mean that their weak voice cannot be heard here? I would like to focus the attention of the country on their complex fate, particularly since the discussion in most cases centers not simply around their problems, but around the question of whether or not these peoples are to remain on earth. Names of disappearing species of animals and plants are being placed on the endangered species list. Yet we are speaking here about peoples!

Every people has its own ecological niche. The life and health of each people depend entirely on the condition of the natural environment. Yet the ecological problem in the Far East is no less acute than in the European part of our country. The intervention of the ministries and departments has turned out to be more terrible than anything else: The Minlesprom [Ministry of the Timber Industry], Mintsvetmet [Ministry of Ferrous Metallurgy], Minvostokstroy [Ministry of Construction in the Eastery Regions of the USSR] and other "bums" [papermaking industries] and "proms" [industrial administrations]. Through their efforts, such an export directionality has been created for the Far Eastern economy in which even Japan enjoys on our land that which it would have in the case of full annexation of the Far East, specifically—a raw material appendage. All Far Easterners suffer from this departmental invasion. As for the native peoples, for them the practice of economic management which has come about spells real tragedy. Let us take, for example, the recent struggle of the Udegey to protect the forest areas in the rayon where they live. Dallesprom [Far Eastern Timber Industry Administration] was planning to develop several large lespromkhozes [timber industry collective farms] there. This was in a region Khabarovsk Kray where the Udegey lived for centuries. This was a tragedy in the making, which could hardly have been averted were it not for the intervention of CPSU Central Committee Secretary Comrade Baklanov. Yet the situation could have arisen in which some Soviet writers had to urgently sit down to write a novel entitled "Really the Last of the Udegey".

Today once again the troubles of the Udegey have become aggravated in Primorskiy Kray. I have received a number of telegrams in which the people write: Please, Yevdokiya Aleksandrovna, you are our deputy. Help us! The invasion of the timber industry collective farms and the Ministry of the Timber Industry is now so severely reflected in the life of the Udegey of Primorskiy kray, that they are ready to defend their virgin forests and the place where they live with gun in hand. I do not think that it will come to this. (Applause).

Why do I present the example of the Udegey people? The Udegey in the Far East live in four settlements, and these settlements are located in four rayons and two krays. Their fates are determined by different ministries which are located in the Far East. Therefore, you can imagine how difficult it is for this people to solve its problems. Yet the fate of the Udegey people is analogous to the fates of all other native peoples and all Far Easterners. According to scientific terminology, we call those Far Easterners who came to these areas from the 17th century to the present day "non-natives". Yet they have been Far Easterners for a long time, and this problem is just as dear to them as to our native peoples.

The fact is that the lifestyle of the native peoples is tied with the taiga and the tundra. When the forest is cut down, when rivers are poisoned, when industry undermines the raw material base of the hunting and fishing trade—all this is not simply imprudent management. We are speaking here of the unregulated, uncontrolled destruction of the very basis of existence of these peoples. The economic development of the region in the last decades has completely ignored the legal rights of the native peoples. It has not taken into consideration the peculiarities of their labor resources, their ethnocultural characteristics, or their specific national interests. The consolidation of collective farms, their reorganization

into sovkhozes and goskomkhozes, as well as many other ill-planned innovations, have contradicted the experience of labor activity and the peculiarities of life and everyday existence which have been formulated within the framework of national culture. Do you know how many small settlements, which were considered ineffective, were destroyed in the last 20 years! If we take only part of the region—from Khabarovsk to Nikolaevsk, it is so small, yet along the banks of the Amur River there were around 50 settlements destroyed, where native residents of the Far East had lived.

The reduction in the sphere of traditional labor, the uncontrolled, and sometimes even encouraged, influx of worshippers of the "long ruble" from other rayons of the country, gradually displaced the native population from the spheres of prestigeous labor. As a result, fishing—the primordeal occupation of many peoples of the Far East—has become the work of a select few. There is a catastrophic decline in the portion of participation of local residents in the hunting trade. With the exception of two or three villages, the marine animal hunting trade has ceased to exist.

At first glance it may seem that the peoples of the North have not received the concern and attention of the state. Actually, at the union and republic level in the last 30 years there have been tens of resolutions adopted which begin with the words "On the future development"...and so forth, and are directed at accelerating the socio-economic development of the northern peoples. However, most of them have merely remained on paper. Particular hopes were pinned on the resolution of 1980. Over 40 union ministries and departments were to have participated in its realization. But what do the ministries and departments care about the needs and concerns of the remote national villages?!

The next resolution turned out to be the next lie for them, and this, in essence, was recently admitted on the pages of SOVETSKAYA KULTURA by CPSU Central Committee worker Aleksandr Sergeyevich Filin. Having visited the Amur villages, he was forced to ask the question: If over R2 million have been invested since 1980 in Khabarovsk Kray for the development of the rayons where the northern peoples live, then why has not one single ruble found its way to those places where these peoples actually dwell? The lion's share of the capital expenditures settles in the rayon centers, in the large industrial settlements where there are singular representatives of the northern peoples. After all this, is it any wonder than 57 percent of the children in the national villages of this same Khabarovsk Kray go to school in unimproved buildings? Before coming to the congress, I toured the rayons of the region and visited the national villages and settlements of the Slavic peoples, our Far Easterners. The schools were in a sad state. The outward appearance of the wooden structures was pitiful. They were so decayed by wood rot and time that the holes had to be plugged with undershirts. I asked: Will something be done this summer, so that next winter the children can go to school in good buildings? I was told: No, this winter they will again study in such schools.

We have already spoken from this podium about the life expectancy of the native peoples. When one becomes acquainted with the illness rate of tuberculosis and infant mortality, there is something to think about. I am thankful to Klara Semenovna Khallik from Estonia, who understands very well the problems of the native peoples of our country. She spoke painfully. Yet the pain of these peoples to me, a representative of one of the native peoples, is even more painful. That is why I am speaking about it today.

Much in the culture of the northern people has been irretrievably lost, but much can still be saved. For this, first of all, we must secure specific territories for each of the aboriginal peoples and for individual groups of these peoples. We must also secure their exclusive right to economic assimilation, the right to engage in hunting and fishing, the right to pasturelands, inland water reservoirs, and coastal waters. Only in this way can we stop the assault of the union departments and ministries on the remnants of the traditional economy of these peoples and preserve them, at least in those boundaries which have been formed today. In the development of ideas expressed at the 19th all-union party conference on questions of reform of the political system, it would be expedient to return to such forms of national-administrative division as the national rayon and the national rural Soviet, which existed in the 1930's. Such national-territorial units must have elements of national sovereignty and be independent in resolving questions of local significance. The electoral organs of such microautonomies should have broader rights and powers than in ordinary administrative-territorial units, and they must have the real possibility of defining the character of the national life in the territories subordinate to them. Their decisions in the sphere of national-specific interests of the population—language, culture, labor, traditions, etc.—must not be rescinded by superior organs of authority. In the Amur basin, where almost half of the native population of the southern Far East lives, there has long been a need to have one of the forms of political autonomy of northern peoples. I personally believe that this should be not an okrug, as is customary for the northern peoples today, but an autonomous oblast. The population numbers, its national make-up, economic potential, degree of industrial assimilation, acuteness of the ecological situation, and character of social and national problems in this region are such that the autonomous okrug, even with consideration for the future expansion of its rights and competencies, would hardly be able to handle all of this.

Equality of peoples should not merely be a constitutional phrase. First of all this equality must be expressed in the status and the rights of the peoples. If 10,000 Jews in the Jewish Autonomous Oblast have their own national-political autonomy, then why can't the over 20,000

native residents of Khabarovsk kray have it too? In any case, I as a scientist-ethnographer cannot give any persuasive answer to this question posed by my countrymen.

Recently among specialists in northern studies and among the northern peoples themselves there has been a growing conviction as to the need for creating an association of northern peoples in the country, a special social organization supported by the government. Such an organization would facilitate the political consolidation of all the northern peoples, the recognition of their rights, and the growth of their self-awareness, political, and social activity.

People's Deputy Kugultinov quite correctly spoke of the need for a legislative statute on the rights of the Soviet people. I fully support this proposal. An analysis of the conflict situations in various rayons of the country convinces us that the absence of constitutional principles on the rights of peoples and the absence of a mechanism guaranteeing their unequivocal adherence, is today the primary source of national problems.

In many Soviet republics today there are heated arguments over the question of which language should be the state language—Russian or the native language. For us this problem does not exist, since the languages of the northern peoples are disappearing. Many have practically disappeared. We hardly need to say that the disappearance of a language means the disappearance of a people. Wherever this is still possible, this process must be stopped today at any cost.

I would like to speak about the mandates of my Far Easterners. Dear deputies, allow me to speak for 3 minutes more. I will not get up to the podium again. (Excitement in the auditorium).

Honorable ministers! In the Far East there is a Far Eastern northern wage coefficient. This northern coefficient is given for the severe climatic conditions. But in no case it is given because some ministry or department decides. However, it turns out that some enterprises receive a coefficient of 1.2, while others receive 1.8, depending on their departmental affiliation. I believe that this injustice should be eliminated and that the northern coefficients should be granted equally. I also believe that difficult climatic conditions give me the right to say that these coefficients should be reflected in pensions, stipends and grants to Far Easterners.

I also want to say that I am a totally peaceful person. My opponent was Lieutenant-General Viktor Ivanovich Novozhilov. I believe that our 8th national-territorial district, on whose territory one can place many European states, deserves to be represented not by one, but by two deputies. There are more than enough problems there not only for one deputy, but probably even for two—both civilian problems, as well as a set of military problems.

No, we cannot depart from the law. Yet I believe it would be right to make a correction in the Law on Elections so that there would be a deputy from the Far Eastern military district as well as from the 8th national-territorial district. Then it would be easier to resolve both the military problems and the civilian ones.

As a candidate for people's deputy, I spoke in military units and on military vessels during the electoral meetings. My electors asked that I relate to the congress the fact that it must necessarily review the question of our sons who are serving in the army. In 2-3 years they will go on reserve. But how will they return—poor as church mice! I believe we should today raise the question of giving them a state aid grant for the initial period after their demobilization. How can we resolve this? I think the minister of defense will find a way. We cannot leave the situation as it is. (Applause).

And here is the last question. When the bulletin was read, deputies spoke up and said that their words had been distorted. They asked that they be corrected. I asked a question at the Soviet of Nationalities as to whether the material of the international Convention of 1957 was familiar. Much depended on this question and on the answer by the chairman of the Soviet of Nationalities. Yet in the bulletin I did not find either my questions or the answers to them. I ask that the Secretariat be very attentive to such problems. Thank you for your attention. (Applause).

A.-M.K. Brazauskas: Comrades, a few announcements.

First. Here is a request that all agrarian deputies, as it is written here, remain in the auditorium now. That is one thing.

Second. Today at 1440 the mandate commission will meet in the Granovit Hall.

Third. The commission to investigate the events in Tbilisi is meeting during the recess near the secretariat on the second floor.

That is all. We will have a 30-minute recess.

A.-M.K. Brazauskas: Comrades, we are continuing our work. Comrade Givi Grigoryevich Gumbaridze has the floor. Comrade Aleksey Vladimirovich Yablokov should get ready.

G.G. Gumbaridze, first secretary of the Georgian Communist Party Central Committee, Tbilisi (Zestafonskiy National-Territorial Electoral District, Georgian SSR): Honorable comrade deputies! Our dialogue with each other is primarily an open discussion with the people and the country. Perhaps never before has the price of the resounding word been so high. Thinking about this, I always see the faces of my fellow countrymen, for whom everything that is said from this rostrum is not simply direct speech, but a matter of their dignity and honor,

their hope and faith in justice. The atmosphere of our congress largely reflects the complex and sometimes contradictory picture of the state of our society.

We have gathered here to discuss the short and long-term prospects for the country's foreign and domestic policy, the constructive program presented by the government. This means we have gathered to determine the most rational methods for moving ahead, so that the anomalies in economics, social and spiritual life, demography, ecology, and international relations, and the questions of political, legal and cultural sovereignty of nations do not arise as an insurmountable obstacle in the path of restructuring.

All of them make themselves known also in the life of Georgia. I have something to say about them, and I had intended to do so, but the content of the preceding discussion and the political situation in the republic force me to review and restructure my presentation. There is an entire series of important circumstances which motivate me to once again return to the April events in Tbilisi.

For us the Tbilisi tragedy holds deep personal pain. Nevertheless, we must rise above our emotions and examine everything that has happened in a broad political context, since we are speaking not only about the authority of power, but also about the prestige of our very restructuring. We bravely exposed the rotten springs of the authoritarian regime, but it is specifically for this reason that the basis for our new political model must from the beginning be high humanitarian and moral standards which determine the foundation of the theoretical searches of Vladimir Ilyich Lenin.

From these positions, the following conclusion is inevitable: Under conditions of democracy, the decision adopted in the republic which has led to such severe consequences, to a crisis of trust and to moral-political detriment, cannot in any case be acknowledged as being politically correct. And each of us feels the responsibility for this.

It is incorrect, or at least politically naive, to qualify the April meetings and demonstrations in Tbilisi as "public merry-making". This was a political action which the demonstrators primarily tried to tie in with the question of national self-determination. The affirmation that supposedly there were no slogans and appeals of a rather extreme direction is also incorrect.

However, all this cannot justify the bloody tragedy which took place on that night. It is easy to accuse a 70-year old woman and a 10-year old youth of extremism, but such an approach holds no prospects, and we have become convinced as to where it might lead. It is also irresponsible to ascribe anti-Russian sentiments to an entire people. There have not been and are not such sentiments of Russophobia in Georgia. We know that the Russian people, the Russian intelligentsia, like all the fraternal peoples, are suffering the pain of the Tbilisi tragedy. Indignation at the bureaucratic dictate really should not be confused with anti-Russian sentiments.

The congress adopted the decision to investigate the causes and circumstances surrounding the events of 9 April, and has created an authoritative commission. I am sure that it will scrupulously study all the materials and will determine the full truth, as Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev demanded, and that the guilty parties, regardless of what position they occupy or where they work, will bear the punishment they deserve. This conviction is shared by all the deputies from Georgia with whom Mikhail Sergeyevich found time to meet during the course of the work of the congress. This meeting served as a characteristic example of a truly open, honest, and much needed dialogue. When the inability to conduct a dialogue leads to placing the wage on power—this is a blow to restructuring. And without saying this truth, we will find no other.

In creating a legal state, we are obligated to instill in the citizens, and especially in the youth, a respect for the law. And it is the party organs and state institutions which must primarily set the examples for the scrupulous adherence to this law. Decisions which are not made collectively, which are made hastily and contrary to the standards of party and official ethics, are always fraught with fateful errors and violations of the law.

Public order is the concern of society. In the extreme case there is the militia and the powers of protecting public order. The involvement of paratrooper units in such civil actions for the purpose of performing functions which are not characteristic of them is difficult even to explain, let alone justify, which certain people have tried to do in vain. Were it not for this, we would today not have any worries about the Army's role in the tragedy. The military prosecutor would not have to open a criminal case, especially since, as has now become clear, the Army units and their commanders had directive orders to implement only protective measures.

There were severe consequences even from the introduction of the curfew, which was announced to the people only 4 minutes before it went into effect.

The phrase also resounded here that we cannot turn the Army against the people. I would say the following: All of us are obligated to protect our Army, not to place on its shoulders the political problems which we have not solved. My fellow countrymen, whose grandfathers and fathers bravely fought at the battle of Borodino and in the battle of Stalingrad, have sacred respect for this tradition. The funerals from the Afghan war also did not bypass our mothers. That is why the republic perceived so acutely and painfully the series of inadmissable evaluations and expressions allowed from this rostrum by a former Afghan fighter. I speak about this with a peculiar personal feeling, as a person who grew up in the family of a Soviet officer and political worker.

Really, elementary ethics and humanity obligated Colonel-General Rodionov, who allowed himself to call the Tbilisi tragedy "Tbilisi provocation", "a Georgian variant of restructuring", to find in his lexicon words which expressed at least some sorrow and compassion for the victims and their relatives. (Applause).

His presentation may be perceived differently. However, how can we justify the harshness, the excess zeal which was not demanded by anyone? Was it not this excessive zeal which served as the reason for the subsequent insincerity and misinformation? How can we justify our actions by referring to a publication in the newspaper ZARYA VOSTOKA in the days of the curfew, if the real facts were distorted even before the official institutions? Only on the third day was the use of sapper shovels verified, only on the fifth—the use of gases, and only after almost a month did the chemical content of these gases become known, although this was extremely important for treatment of the victims. These facts were stubbornly denied in the daily meetings not only to us, but to the two representatives of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo- -Comrades Z. A. Sheverdnadze and G. P. Razumovskiy, as well as to the high leadership of the country. Perhaps not everyone knows, but it was only their persistence and only the principle of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev that allowed us to make headway in seeking the truth. We are grateful to him also for his help in sending to the republic highly trained medical specialists from Moscow, Leningrad and other cities, as well as from abroad, the representatives of the Soviet and International Red Cross.

Reorganization of society must be accompanied by the reorganization of institutions of power. Primarily it must be accompanied by the development, and sometimes even the radical change in style, forms and methods of the work of party organizations. It is unthinkable without renovation. It cannot be decreed by volitional decisions. Under conditions of glasnost, we must condemn efforts at forceful pressure on any unsanctioned manifestations of thought, word, or national sentiment. We must successively overcome the genes of authoritarianism which have long been lodged in us. We must learn to talk with people, to find convincing and precise arguments in any difficult dialogue.

When the principle positions of restructuring take on a declarative character, the public initiative which they awaken, not finding a natural outlet, begins to take on the form of open protest, as happened in our case. Therefore, consolidation, prudent compromise, and integration of all the potential possibilities of society—that is the only way to avoid unnecessary intellectual and physical victims in the process of revolutionary break-up.

Experience confirms that one of the most effective forms for this is constructive dialogue. We cannot divide society into formals and informals, and then even to instill a strictly political meaning into these concepts. We must at least from now on work in such a way as to convince of our sincerity even those who have become disinchanted in the prospect of such dialogue. We must convince them that we stand together with the people in deed, and not just in words, that we share their social and political ideals, that we give [the people] everything, not thinking of our own official success.

Restructuring has expanded the framework and the forms of manifesting national sentiments and interests, and it is time to remove many outdated stereotypes from our ideological baggage. Recently in the republic, for the first time since the Leninist period, the Day of Restoration of the Georgian State was celebrated, and this is as it should be. Historical dates are a tribute to events, and they do not disappear from the memory at someone's whim. By depriving the people of them, we take away their spiritual and moral foundations, and disrupt the continuity of their historically formulated political orientation.

Events such as those in Tbilisi are most easily explained as the flaring of national emotions. But did they not manifest in some measure the results of those well-known deformations of socialism and especially the constitutionally secured federal principles in Soviet statehood which had been allowed for many decades in the country? There was a bankrupting of the existing thousand-year old traditions and ideals of Georgian statehood, with which the sole desire of the people for cultural, linguistic and physical survival are equated, and to whose defense the political and military energy of tens of generations was devoted.

During the years of repression, the flower of the Georgian nation was destroyed. Tens of thousands of innocent people were thrown into jails and imprisoned in camps. Among the fabricated judicial processes there were the so-called "cases" of Georgian writers, theatre artists, scientific and technical intelligentsia, and many others. The gloom of the 30's, 40's and 50's cast its shadow even beyond the boundary of Stalinism, to the year 1956, when the deceived youth perished on these very same streets of Tbilisi. We cannot overlook all this in a political work during the epoch of glasnost.

Today, when the party is successively conducting a rehabilitation of slandered names and principally filling in the gaps in our history, we must everywhere objectively get to the bottom of our past, especially the recent past, without elevating scientific studies and arguments to the rank of big politics. In order to really give power to the Soviets, it is time we knew how this power was ratified in Georgia in 1918-1921, to have a fair historical evaluation of the violation of the agreement between Georgia and Soviet Russia which was approved by Vladimir Ilyich Lenin. We must objectively examine the basic principles of this agreement as applied to the present day and soberly restore the political portraits of well-known leaders of this contradictory epoch.

The rapid growth of national awareness testifies to the fact that the people have begun believing in restructuring, and that they strive to realize their sacred hopes by means of it. Today, in my opinion, we need not so much recipes, as a continuous scientific interpretation of all the processes, without any haste or prejudice.

Thus, the community is perceiving the questions of political sovereignty with particular acuteness. We must continue to develop work on creating its reliable economic and constitutional basis, as well as the sociopolitical mobilization of the people in a creative vein. We have begun, although with some delay, the development of the conception of republic cost accounting for the purpose of more rational ownership, management, and use of local natural resources. Work on the outline of the Georgian Constitution, in our opinion, must be directed at harmonizing the relations with the center, their correct combination with the real political and economic sovereignty of the republic.

In our opinion, the need has arisen to perform in-depth development in the multinational republics and regions on the question of ensuring the balance of inter-national interests with the interests of the native nation, primarily through language, culture, and other national values. This, undoubtedly, would facilitate increased trust.

I would like to stress that the republic has all the capacities, provided there is mutual agreement and respect, for solving all intranational problems, primarily those which concern the Abkhaz people, with whom the Georgian people have been closely tied by age-old fraternal relations. There are also problems which especially today disturb the youth and the republic as a whole, and which are in the stage of imminent solution. We must all learn how to resolve questions so as not to lead society into a dead end and not to inflict detriment upon the progress of our common cause.

In order to indeed promote restructuring, we must work out principally new conceptions of the national question. National energy is a huge reserve which we must learn to correctly manage. This is why today the consolidation on the basis of true pluralism of political, economic and national interests is as necessary as air, so that the collective intellect of our party and the Soviets may triumph everywhere over mediocrity and conservatism.

I would like to say one more thing from this rostrum. Our moral sense must not betray us, so as not to discredit that political force thanks to which both the 19th Party Conference and our congress embarked specifically upon a democratic path. I believe that the attitude toward party authority at the current turning-point stage is also a choice: Either in favor of restructuring, or not in favor of it. The party is the initiator of renovation of our society. It is the one who must stand at the avant-garde of restructuring. Thank you for your attention. (Applause).

A.-M.K. Brazauskas: Deputy Yablokov has the floor. Comrade Chabanov should get ready.

A.V. Yablokov, USSR Academy of Sciences corresponding member, head of laboratory at the USSR Academy of Sciences N.K. Koltsov Institute of Developmental Biology, Moscow (representing the scientific societies and associations under the USSR Academy of Sciences): Honorable congress! Honorable Comrade Chairman! I speak in the name of the entire group of delegates from the Far East, from Siberia, Leningrad, Podmoskovye, Moscow, Zaporozhye and other places associated with problems of the ecology. We support the basic principles presented in the speeches of Comrades Gorbachev and Ryzhkov. However, we believe that an analysis of the ecological problems does not in full measure reflect the alarming state of affairs in this sphere of our country. In the presentations of the overwhelming majority of deputies, ecological problems were rightly listed among the primary and most important ones. The situation is such: 20 percent of our country's population lives in zones of ecological distress, and another 35-40 percent lives in ecologically unfavorable conditions. As a result, there is a rapid increase in the illness rate associated with deterioration of the quality of the environment. One in every three men living in such rayons will contract cancer sometime during his life. Every year the number of cancer victims increases. Infant mortality is higher in some regions than in a number of African countries, while our average life expectancy is 4-8 years lower than in the developed countries of the world. In some regions, as for example in Zaporozhye, it is declining. In this day and age, comrades, it is declining!

The main reasons for the deterioration of the ecological situation in the country are both political and economic. As a result of many years of distortions in the political system, the Soviets have lost real power in the local areas. We have experienced, one might say, not only depeasantization, of which we have already spoken, but also "desovietization". As was determined even by the 27th party congress, the intervention of the party apparatus into economic management functions has been unjustifiably broad. Another part of the power of the soviets, possibly even the largest part, has been taken over by the ministries and departments. The soviets have been placed in the position of petitioners, and often agree to ecologically dangerous projects against their will, since it is only through them that they see a possibility for development of the territories. There are no effective economic incentives for resource conservation at the department level. An inevitable consequence of this is the extensive character of exploitation of natural resources and the extensive character of development of the departments themselves, about which less is said. Under conditions of departmental monopoly, the development of each sector proceeds without consideration for the pressure on the environment of neighboring sectors. With lack of power by the soviets, this leads to the elemental, ecologically dangerous development of entire regions.

A second group of reasons for deterioration of the ecological situation in the country may be considered ideological. We have erred in believing that the socialist system of economic management automatically ensures rational utilization of nature. Having been raised on this thesis, we at one time refused to participate in many world programs for saving the environment. According to the estimates of our diplomats, the USSR does not participate in several tens of over 100 ecologically oriented international agreements. While criticizing capitalist use of nature, we overlooked the fact that the leading capitalist countries have to a significant degree been able to manage those ecological problems with which we are currently faced. The process of socialization of nature is rapidly proceeding in all the developed countries of the world, while in our country a reverse tendency might sooner be noted—"desocialization". Natural resources are monopolistically used by departments or even groups of persons. A clear example of this is the fencing off of beaches in the resort zones of the Ukrainian SSR, and the directly opposite development of the right to beach access for any citizen as compared with,say, the United State of America or Italy.

The absence of precise information on the status of the environment also complicates the ecological situation. The absence of information is sometimes caused by departmental concealment of data. I support the proposal previously expressed here that we should consider such concealment a real ecological crime. We have already justifiably and repeatedly condemned here the secrecy of data on radiation pollution. Sometimes data are not secret, but are not accessible to the public. Not many people know, for example, that in 1987, one-fifth of all the sausage goods inspected in the Soviet Union (official Ministry of Health inspection) contained toxic chemicals in quantities which were harmful to the health. The same is true also for 42 percent of the products in children's milk kitchens (just think—children's milk kitchens!), and of 30 percent of all the food products in Leningrad.

These data are not secret, but they were published in a circulation of 18 copies. However, basically we simply do not have the necessary information in general. For example, even Goskomstat [State Committee for Statistics] does not know how many millions of hectares of arable land have been flooded over by water reservoirs. One does not need to be a prophet to say that the ecological crisis in the country will increase and intensify in the next few years. The social tension associated with the ecology will also increase. Ecology is already today placing strict limitations on the development of the national economy, and in some places it is even determining the domestic policy situation. Last year, over 2 million people stopped work, signed petitions, or participated in meetings for reasons of ecology.

There is only one solution. The party, which has voluntarily taken upon itself the heavy burden of political leadership, must quickly and decisively "turn green"—that is, it must face the problems of ecology. (Applause). Otherwise, ecological discontent will be politicized outside the framework of the party. At all levels we must recognize the fact that the time of ecologically incompetent managers is past. If, as Comrade Gorbachev stated in his speech, those not very great funds which were allocated by the state for ecology were spent ineffectively or not spent at all, the reason for this is not the absence of technology or funds, but rather it is the ecological-political short-sightedness of the leaders in local areas and in the center.

What must we do in the country to improve the ecological situation?

First of all, we must return local power to the soviets. The soviets must become the real masters of the natural resources in their territory. At the same time, we must engage such mechanisms of nature utilization which would ensure the protection of the environment against pilferage. Such mechanisms do exist. They are—introducing payments for natural resources which would ensure the financial independence of the soviets and would serve as one of the basics for regional cost accounting.

Another mechanism is the real implementation of the principle used throughout the world: "The polluter pays" for real compensation of the loss inflicted by the enterprises to nature as well as to the health of man. We often forget about the latter.

The central departments which have been liberated from economic management functions must become the scientific-technical headquarters of the sectors. And even the Council of Ministers itself must become the scientific-technical headquarters for restructuring. One of the main ecological requirements for such reorganization is not only the construction of purification structures, but also the transition to progressive and ecologically safe low-waste and waste-free technology.

I believe that the search for some special laws for our economy (individual deputies have spoken about this here) which differ from the laws of world economy has lead to an administrative-command style of development of the national economy and to an endless succession of party-government resolutions on the development of the sectors. Our national economy has become reminiscent of a jumping frog, if you will forgive me, as a biologist, such a comparison. Each jump is a resolution. Sometimes the jump is forward, sometimes to the right, and sometimes to the left, depending on what frightens it at the given moment.

The permanently operating Supreme Soviet and budget control will, I hope, allow us to forever reject such a style of national economic development. The Supreme Soviet must demand of the Council of Ministers that it sharply improve control over the quality of our environment. It is indicative that out of more than 300 toxic chemicals

which have been approved for application, all the control services in the country can account for no more than 120 of them. But where are the other 180? We simply do not know. We need an all-encompassing state ecological expert investigation. The decision on it was made by the Supreme Soviet back in 1985, at the first session after the beginning of restructuring. Yet in fact this decision has not been implemented. I participated in a number of state ecological expert investigations: of the South Ukraine Atomic Power Station, the second phase of the Astrakhan Gas Condensate Complex, and the territorial integrated scheme for the Baykal region. And I must say that such a commission of experts is yet in fact powerless, and the investigation is conducted on semi-public principles.

Without an ecological expert investigation at the stage of pre-design development (before sizeable funds have been spent), we will always have immobilization of vast capital, as is the case today. After all, the people will ultimately, by the most primitive but also the most effective method, simply by the method of mass disobedience and demonstrations, conduct the final, people's, expert investigation without us.

How is it that the Council of Ministers allows the construction of major enterprises not only without an ecological expert investigation, but even without projects, sometimes even without technical-economic substantiation? That is what is happening today with the Tyumen petrochemical complex. This has already been mentioned several times. Yet the expenditures for it will be several times greater than the expenditures for the BAM [Baykal-Amur Main Line]. There is no project, there are no technical-economic substantiations, but the Council of Ministers adopts the decision to open financing. Even the term "privilege financing" has arisen, which means that construction is beginning without the necessary project documents required by law.

We speak of creating a legal state, yet the highest executive authority turns out to be the main violator of the laws. Both the law and reason state: We cannot build without allocation of land. Yet, for example, the Mingasprom [Ministry of the Gas Industry] willfully seizes plots of land in the Yamal, physically displacing the native residents from it. It conducts drilling operations and builds roads without allocation of land. And all this is done with the sanction of the Council of Ministers! I did not believe it, asked to see the documents, and they sent them to me by messenger from Salekhard. The documents state: The Council of Ministers has extended the privilege financing for the Mingazprom even this year. We must send the most serious instructions to the Supreme Soviet and the Council of Ministers to urgently put an end to this barbarism (the term which, by the way, was used by Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov himself) in the application of our natural resources. (Applause).

The Supreme Soviet must take under its permanent control the matter of radically restructuring state management in the sphere of environmental protection, which was begun with the creation of the USSR Goskompriroda [State Committee for the Protection of Nature]. Increasing the status of this committee (which was repeatedly mentioned in the press prior to the congress, and then also discussed at the congress itself) is a vitally necessary task. Today this committee is almost powerless. This is not the kind of committee we expected!

World experience tells us that for stabilization of the ecological situation we must spend around 2 percent of the gross national product on environmental protection. And in order to improve the quality of the environment (that which is an extreme necessity for us today) we must spend no less than 5 percent. As yet, we are spending only around 1 percent. And those R135 billion for the next few five-year plans about which Nikolay Ivanovich spoke here are a ridiculously small amount. We must admit this. The basic financial reserves, perhaps, are found not only in conversion. I believe that the basic reserves may be found in the rejection of the extensive development of sectors. We can drill 15,000 wells each year, as we have been doing. Or we may obtain 5-10, and even 20 times more oil from each skillfully drilled well. Specialists believe that we can save several billion rubles a year on oil well drilling alone.

I am convinced that tens of billions of rubles are spent ineffectively in the national economy. Let us take the problem of buying pesticides. Three years ago we bought half a billion rubles worth of pesticides. This was in spite of the fact that one-third of the pesticides is lost along the road to the field, while the other two-thirds poison our health. This is where the deputies who will work on the budget in the Supreme Soviet commissions and committees can really get down to business.

Among other instructions to the Supreme Soviet for solving ecological problems are the following: We must put our environmental protection legislation in order. There are many gaps and oversights here. We still do not have an all-union law on the protection of nature. Although, perhaps, now it is more important to speak about a law to protect the environment in which we live. We must join numerous international conventions and agreements on environmental protection and honestly fulfill the responsibilities which we have assumed. Here is a small example. The World Charter on Nature which was adopted with the support of the USSR in 1982 has still not been publicized in our country.

We need a legislative mechanism for realizing the inalienable right of native residents to use their territory. The local soviet authorities must have the right of "veto" in questions concerning the life supporting systems of the small peoples and their national culture. (Applause). We must not be afraid that such a right of "veto" will

hinder the development of the territory. The local sites will be interested in its development, and specifically its development, but not its pilferage. Everyone will benefit—both man and nature.

Finally, there is one more thing that we could do, right here at this congress. In developing the sections on environmental protection in the speeches under discussion, and taking into consideration the many presentations of the deputies, we must give ecological problems first priority importance. It would probably be expedient to adopt a special resolution, announcement or declaration of the congress on the ecological status of the environment. This is not a law on which jurists must work for a long time, verifying every comma. Such a resolution would become a testimony to the fact that the congress perceives the ecological danger as being very serious and tells the people that these problems will be solved. Perhaps it would be good to adopt similar documents on the economy, on the national question, and on the status of deputies. There is a basis for these documents. Without them it would be difficult for me, and for you too, comrade deputies, to report to the voters on the work of the congress. (Applause).

In conclusion, I would like to present two short questions. The ecological problem is so important for the USSR that it seems expedient to make the proposed Supreme Soviet Committee on Ecology a congress committee. This may relate also to the committees on the economy and the national question. The Constitution does not prohibit this. We have the right to create a congress committee, particularly since there are currently few ecology specialists in the Supreme Soviet. Most of them (30-40 people) who would like to work actively on this committee were not included in the Supreme Soviet. In order to involve them in solving these most important problems, perhaps we should create a congress committee, in the way of an exception. (Applause).

Here is the last thing about which I wanted to speak. Part of the deputies still believe that Moscow residents have certain specific interests. Comrades, 85 percent of the Moscow delegation is comprised of deputies elected from all-union organizations. I, for example, was nominated by the scientific societies from Kiev, Minsk, and Saratov. And so it was with most of them. There are, after all, problems, common problems for the entire country, and they must be solved. Our congress mail speaks of this. I have received tens of requests for ecological help from Kaliningrad, Leningrad, Sochi, Salekhard, Nikolayev, Vladimir and Ryazan Oblasts, Novosibirsk, Volgograd, and Odessa. All these materials, of course, will be forwarded to the Committee on Ecology, which will give them close examination.

Yet here the question arises: How will the committee be formulated? The congress is coming to a close. All the committees must begin their work, but we do not know how they are to be formulated. Judging by the agenda, this will take place on Saturday [10 June], when the congress finishes its work. Perhaps the presidium should think about at least appointing the committee chairmen, and then they can formulate [the committees]. Because we are at a loss, in any case, the ecologists.

The ecology, along with the economy and national relations, has become one of the country's main problems. We believe that the set of measures which was briefly outlined in this presentation would be an important step towards sharply improving the ecological situation.

If we cannot breathe the air, cannot drink the water, and cannot eat the food, then all social problems lose their meaning. If we do not solve the ecological problem, housing construction and the fulfillment of the food program are also cast into doubt. The solution of ecological problems is exceptionally important also from a political standpoint, since it leads to the consolidation of society. Both the "left" and "right-wingers" are in favor of the immediate solution of ecological problems. We must necessarily seek ways of consolidating our society. Thank you for your attention. (Applause).

A.-M.K. Brazauskas: Deputy Chabanov has the floor. Comrade Zalygin should get ready.

A.I. Chabanov, general director of the "Rotor" Science and Production Association (Cherkasskiy Territorial Electoral Okrug, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic): Esteemed comrades, I had prepared a dry, critically constructive speech, but during the break my comrades asked me to take a couple of minutes to reply to Comrade Yemelyanov's speech. This is what I would like to say: Many "industrialists" know me, they know that I speak sincerely, honestly, and firmly. It may be that nobody else in this hall has more scars than I, caused by the party apparatus and individual party apparatus officials and taking the form of reprimands, severe reprimands, and attempts at expulsion from the party. I was chased out of one job—I moved on to another, and people again started expelling me. But I would like to say, comrades, that it is individual apparatus officials who are behind this. And none of this has anything to do with the party itself. While we were conducting the election campaign, the overwhelming majority of people asked me about my attitude to the party's position today. I explained this position and gained total approval. What I would like to say, dear comrades, is that the communist party and the communist ideology do not belong to our country alone; they are the result of the world civilization's development. The Communists' ideology took shape in ancient times, beginning with the revolt of Spartacus. Humane ideas have built up over the centuries—people thought of better ways to live and offered theoretical proof that this could be achieved under socialism. So we have no right, comrades, to adopt a frivolous attitude to the burden we are carrying on behalf of all mankind, to the responsibility for developing the worldwide gain that is communist ideology.

I want to say a few words about constructiveness. What actually is the task facing a Communist, especially a Communist in leadership position? Primarily to take responsibility and to struggle, to take it on and to struggle. I have no desire to sound like the comrades who spoke on the subject of Popov's and Afanasyev's speeches: They should to get out, it was said, and get their hands dirty. This has happened many times before, people said these things and got applauded, but the outcome was bad. But in this specific instance, in my capacity as leader and scientist, for example, I would like to tell Comrade Yemelyanov how I would act in this instance as a Communist. I would take a rayon or at least a collective farm—being an academician you have the knowledge—and, as a Communist, get down to overcoming the resistance of individual apparatus officials, struggle against them, even incur their displeasure, but make that kolkhoz better than the farms in the Netherlands. That, I believe, is how a Communist ought to act. (Applause)

Of course we have problems with the apparatus, or rather with individual apparatus officials. They are, so to speak, products of the old "stagnation" period or even of the personality cult period. We must realize this. I would also say that such people are still to be found everywhere. I would cite the following example of obsolete thinking. Budennyy, for example, was a progressive commander during the civil war, but by the time of the Patriotic War he was unable to apply his concepts to produce anything substantial, to be of benefit to our people. I want to say that people with an obsolete mentality and obsolete methodology, like Budennyy, are still to be found in our country, at the bottom and at the top alike. It would be desirable for comrades among them who can see the similarity between themselves and those who have "grown old," as Budennyy did by the time of the Patriotic War, to make up their minds to depart. And as for those who are unwilling to depart—it is our task to help them depart through a verdict secured in struggle. (Applause)

And now, from the viewpoint of criticisms we will be making here on Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov's report. I would like to say that this will not be simply a criticism of some positions taken in the report. This, the way I understand it, is the task of our congress, whose duty it is to continue work in order to correct shortcomings, and not in the sense of accepting that things are bad and there is nothing to be done about it. I would propose that we vote for Nikolay Ivanovich, and I recommend that we support his candidacy. But we must also help him in many respects, and we must take on a lot of things we used to leave alone. We are different people and, of course, there are many among us in this hall who could stand as alternative candidates for election. I know many general directors, like Comrade Volskiy, for example, who has been kept on in Nagorno-Karabakh Oblast—he is also a major specialist who could work here. I am in favor of alternative candidates for election and I believe that here it would of course be correct to consult in the first place, to consider proposals and recommendations for candidacies submitted to the congress, then to consult the Politburo, and to nominate someone as candidate. We would support this. The methodology does need to be amended somewhat—we sense this.

I think that the meaning of my remark at the Supreme Soviet sitting is clear. Much of what Comrade Shmelev said was also on my mind. And I wanted to say it clearly right there, at the Supreme Soviet. My remarks on the report. First, working on machine building with the Council of Ministers, with the Bureau for Machine Building, I want to say that there have been great changes there: New people, new ideas, new machines have emerged. I think that this is a guarantee of imminent change in the state of affairs in machine building. There have been major changes also along a number of other avenues of the Council of Ministers' work. On the other hand, I would say that Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov's report today is, generally speaking, little different from previous speeches and previous reports. As if the specific figure of R6 billion allocated for social needs had only just been added. As a matter of fact, Nikolay Ivanovich, R6 billion is crumbs, it is very little. The data given about our expenditures on defense—R77 billion—is also just a figure; it has now been made public and we know about it. The report makes no promises that we will have built communism in 20 years' time. And all the rest is very similar to everything we have heard before. Like the winged phrase about gross output [val], for example. We have been criticizing all this ever since the sixties, and it was back in the sixties that the phrase "overwhelming gross output" [devyatyy val—meaning "the ninth wave," an untranslatable pun on 'val' in the sense of gross output and 'val' in the sense of wave] appeared in our country. "Industrialists" and "agriculturalists" alike remember it well. And now Nikolay Ivanovich says that he will be unable to cope with these gross volume indicators and abolish them in the current 5-Year Plan period. I think, Nikolay Ivanovich, that the indicator of volume accountability ought to be abolished as of 1 July. (Applause) And there are no problems in this regard.

Take another winged expression—the lack of a mechanism ensuring the introduction of scientific achievements. Here we are, saying this in the 4th year of restructuring, in the late eighties! Cast your minds back to the sixties, when Academician Kapitsa wrote his booklets, explaining and telling us the meaning of introduction and the pedagogical problems associated with it. Have we really been lacking such a mechanism all this time? First of all, we do have it and it must be utilized, even though not everything has been fully worked out from the viewpoint of the democratization of economic life. Even in the "Rotor" Science and Production Association we organized—with difficulty, of course, but we did it—science and production firms, we have no problems as regards the introduction of scientific results, and we seek innovations. Therefore, the mechanism is already in existence, and your definition is incorrect. Let

me emphasize this in particular: We cannot drag over from 1960 to 1989 the problem of lacking a mechanism for introduction.

Take another question for example—the dissipation of capital investments. It is something else we have known about since the sixties. What does this indicate? It indicates, of course, that a fresh influx of people is needed in the Council of Ministers. We have been saying this since the sixties. And now, in 1988 compared with 1985, there has been a 31-percent increase in new construction. But we cannot find capital investment funds for the breakthrough avenues in machine building. As a matter of fact, we did not fulfill the resolution on machine building, which was of crucial importance. This is because we divide the work among departments, and they are understandably unwilling to relinquish anything of theirs. Once again we spoke, just as we did in the sixties, about departmental barriers. There was just a slight variation, an amplification: You said that several ministries were eliminated and 600,000 persons were released from the state management apparatus. First, it is necessary to look and see to what use these 600,000 persons have been put. They must be properly transferred into the system of the national economy to ensure that they are put to good use, without moral or material loss. As a matter of fact, I know exactly where these 600,000 persons have ended up. They have not been put to sufficiently effective use.

Or, by way of another example, there was nothing in the report about the anticipated budget for 1989 or a forecast for 1990. And yet we are a parliament, not some sort of conference. We can spend 3-4 hours listening, with a break if need be, and should without fail look and see what sort of a budget we'll have this year and what are the prospects for next year; we should exchange opinions. Or another question that has been overlooked—the political question concerning restructuring. The problem made no mention of the following problem: Some 20-30 categories of mass consumer goods are in short supply, goods like soap, detergents, socks, and so on. During the transition period (is this so hard to understand?) the Council of Ministers must have an apparatus to monitor this work, to review state orders, to apply economic levers—an eye must be kept on all this. This enormous political work has been overlooked, and seems to be altogether missing from the report. This is trivial as far as we are concerned, but it must be resolved. It is easy to resolve, otherwise we would blow restructuring apart.

I would like to say, comrades, that we certainly have no right to play down the importance of our congress. I would say that our congress was meant to lay down the strategic tasks of our society's development in this century, in other words through the year 2000. This is the first Congress of People's Deputies. I think that we must bear in mind Lenin's idea that it is necessary to define the general before moving on to the specific. Anyone working on specifics, looking at the next 1-2 years, would always come up against specific problems. And I believe that our society's task through the year 2000 is, comrades, to create a new socialist civilization, to ensure people's happiness and the harmonious development of all nations in our multinational society. I would say that man's happiness—since time immemorial—has been the main issue and has stemmed from the community: food, gemstones for your woman, procreation of the species. This is why we must treat our ethnic groups, even the tiniest ones, in a way we have never treated them before. This is a question of fundamental importance.

I wish to say that there is one point in economic problems on which I disagree with Comrade Shmelev—that we have to spend 10 years doing nothing but "clearing the debris." Our strength, comrades, is immeasurable and we are totally different from the way critics depict us. We can and must boost the economy and solve the overall task of building a socialist civilization if we are to get society to respond.

We realize how this should be done. We can force our pace forward, and there are many examples of this being done. Nonetheless, I believe that the task of our deputies' corps, of our congress for its 5-year term, is to lay the foundations of a socialist civilization along the paths of restructuring and overcoming pseudosocialist distortions engendered by the personality cult and stagnation periods. We can under no circumstances wait 18 months until the start of the next 5-Year Plan Plan. We cannot allow the word "acceleration," which was correctly used, to disappear from our vocabulary. It is a certain section of the executive apparatus that has eroded this word. And it seems to me that, in all likelihood, people who prepared the material for Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov are still sticking to the old "Budennyy style." This is how it seems to me, comrades. (Applause)

I wish to emphasize, comrades, that we here are not now questioning the fact that socialism enjoys great advantages over the capitalist method of economic management. We must develop this, we must prove it by utilizing society's response. But upholding the advantages of socialism is no joke for us—it is, after all, a gain for world civilization. We must develop it skillfully, and yet we distort it and then say that the time has come to move on to a different system and so on. This is not right.

Let me cite an example. We do a lot of work with partners abroad, with the capitalist world. There they are, in the course of conversations, saying that they are in favor of our restructuring, they are helping it, they sympathize with it. Why is this, one might ask? They say: Imagine a well cared-for small house and garden, and next to it a skyscraper which is about to collapse. If it collapses, its debris will fall all over the small home and its garden. It appears that the European countries are this well cared-for home, while the skyscraper which might collapse is our own country, so it must be helped, restructuring must be helped.

It is said that bad things will happen if restructuring suffers defeat in our country. And if restructuring is defeated, it will make a tremendous contribution to the development of world civilization [sentence as published]. We know that.

I want to say, comrades, that we must certainly resolve the following task. And it should have figured in the text of the report. The first section concerns the restoration of the state's intellectual power. Many of us have spoken here about pensions, about the elderly, about pensioners, about mothers—figures, only the figures by which aid must be increased. And the same with education, medicine, ecology, and so on. The first point in all our reports must be the restoration of the state's intellectual potential, and everything must be put down in figures and time schedules, in figures and time schedules.

I would like to make special mention of the ecology, of the fact that ecology of course involves a major program, but there is no need to take so long working on it, with Nikolay Ivanovich saying that some time by years' end we shall have it prepared and submitted for approval. It took our own "Rotor" Association just a few months to prepare such a program from the Cherkassy region. It envisages the development of our city into a resort within a 10-year period. Enterprises themselves should take on such tasks.

We even have a supplementary decision concerning the Aral Sea. Thus it cannot be said that bringing the Aral Sea back to normal is an insoluble problem. Quite the contrary: We realize and we know that this problem can be solved and we can play a part in this work, and we can work out how it could be done.

Of course, the next question is the proper provision of financial resources. We can examine it objectively. Proposals were made here, but they are far from complete. We know how it should be done, we realize the tremendous funds that can be made available right now. But the most fundamental question here concerns changing the functions of ministries and departments. We do not advocate the mandatory elimination of ministries. It is a question of changing their functions. Ministries should not deal with gross volumes. They should be the think-tanks. They should adopt purely economic, exclusively economic approaches—from the viewpoint of developing specific categories of output, output quality, anti-monopoly alternatives, transportation shipments, and so on. This is why the questions of changing ministries' functions must be resolved without fail in time for the next congress. One last point. What is more, enterprises under departmental jurisdiction, Mikhail Sergeyevich, must be given within 1 month the right to withdraw from departments and join other associations, other enterprises, while retaining the state orders allocated to them. An all-union arbitration commission must be set up to monitor enterprises' direct economic ties. This is of fundamental importance. Thank you for your attention. (Applause).

A.-M.K. Brazauskas: So, comrades, we have three more speakers remaining. As you can see, each one takes a little time away from the next. Nevertheless, I ask you to keep to the schedule and keep your speeches as short as possible. The floor is given to Sergey Pavlovich Zalygin, writer. Comrade Vladimir Matveyevich Gvozdev should get ready.

S.P. Zalygin, writer, editor-in-chief of the journal NOVYY MIR, secretary of the USSR Union of Writers governing board, Moscow (representing the USSR Union of Writers): Comrade deputies! It so happened that recently I was looking into an old encyclopedia and read the following text there: "In 1682-1690 the Kremlin witnessed violent disputes about "faith". The streltsy [Russian regular army soldiers] and people from the settlements gathered here with demands to expand their rights and to replace the rulers. (Excitement in auditorium). You understand the matter: From time to time, every 50 or 100 years, perhaps, is it a custom in Russia to meet like this. And this would be good were it not for one circumstance: Each time everything we must begin everything all over again. It is as if this huge country, with its most varied national shadings and customs, had no historical experience. Yes, each time we begin all over again.

I was listening now to the speeches of our economists. That is wonderful. That is, perhaps, the most serious thing that we have heard here. It made a great impression on me. Yet I would like to say: I am an elderly person. In 1929-30 I attended a technical school and studied agricultural economics from Chayanov's textbook, and you know, to this very day I have perhaps not read anything as interesting in this sense. (Applause).

Today we are creating an agrarian committee. Dear comrades, peasants, you know that we are now solving ecological and economic problems. It may very well be that we will now be faced with very serious trials and difficult years. But one thing we can say: If we preserve the land, if we preserve the peasant—we will survive. If not—there is no way out. (Applause).

And it seems to me that it would be very good for our new agrarian committee to borrow very very much—and I will not specify this question now—from the work experience of the Russian zemstvo. After all, this was an unusual democratic social organism. Perhaps today part of the funds which we are directing to public health, education and road construction may be handed over directly to these agrarian committees, if they should develop. They would manage these funds better than someone from the center manages them. Every now and then, a downright fantasmagorical situation is created. On one hand, we are launching a "Buran", and on the other—in these very same days some "Aunt Motya" forgets to shut off the valve and for 55 minutes pours fuel onto the fire from a broken pipeline, which is near Ufa.

That is the combination. And very often we cannot find our way out of those problems, out of those crises, which no one creates for us. We create them ourselves, with our own hands. In connection with this, we cannot help but recall the very angry man that Churchill was. Yet he was probably correct. In any case, we must consider his words to the effect that the Bolsheviks successfully overcome those same difficulties which they create for themselves.

Well, let us say, we are talking about the problem of the Aral. This, comrades, is a world catastrophe. The words of Deputy Kailbergenov resounded here on this subject, but no one stopped to think, or perhaps did think but somehow never quite expressed himself about the fact that this is a catastrophe of which there has yet been no equal in the world. You think that this is simply some kind of accidental oversight—that they wanted to get one thing, but got something else instead? I do not know if that is correct. I do not know how to evaluate this fact. I can also think that, after all, this catastrophe was planned. When this project arose, all this work on the Aral, scientists warned us, as for example Academician Dorodnitsin, that we cannot build a dam on the Amur-Darya. But they built it anyway. The planners were told ahead of time: Let the Aral die off beautifully. So it has died. Only it has not been beautiful. They were told ahead of time: If necessary, we will take the Aral for irrigation to the last drop. And so they have taken it. So what is the value of our planning, if we foresee such consequences and nevertheless go forward, butt our heads against all obstacles to make something that is worthless? In this regard I have a direct inquiry to the Minvodkhoz [Ministry of Land Reclamation and Water Resources]. Since it is no longer there, then I will direct it to the Council of Ministers. Is someone at fault for this catastrophe, or are there no guilty parties? Let us, after all, get to the bottom of this. Who did this? Why? So that we do not repeat such grievious events. We do not need any repressions here. I am not advocating that. I merely believe that we should know all the "heroes of our time". (Applause).

Now another commission on saving the Aral is being created. To whom is this commission subordinate? Why, to the Soyuzgiprovodkhoz [All-Union State Project-Research Institute on Waterway Management]. The very same organization that destroyed the Aral. Can we give it more billions as a reward for this destruction? Moreover, the saving of the Aral today depends not on hydrotechnical measures. It requires agricultural, forest, and chemical reclamation. Institutions such as Giprozem [State Institute for Planning Land Reclamation] should be working there, and not hydrotechnical builders. Here we need specifically that land reclamation which Soyuzgiprovodkhoz and Minvodkhoz (its name has been changed now) have disdained. They gave 2-3 percent of the funds for land reclamation as such, and all the rest they spent on hydrotechnical construction, on canals which are 10 times more profitable for the builders. And we are once again entrusting this matter to these same people? People such as Voropayev? That is a very dubious decision.

We have spent R130 billion over the last 20 years for land reclamation through the former Minvodkhoz. If we had given these 130 billion not to the department, but directly to those kolkhozes and sovkhozes, those farms which themselves would have managed this money, we would have seen more benefit from it. Yet for us, all measures have to go through departments. Why is this?

People always tell me that I am against land reclamation. I am not against it. I am in favor of that land reclamation which the farms themselves want. But I am against that land reclamation which is forced upon us. That is all. Even now we are imposing an entire series of such projects on our peasantry, on our agriculture. We must avoid this order, or else things will come to a bad end. I am against earmarked funds. For example, we allocate billions for some ministry, for this same land reclamation (two times more than for public health), and no one else can spend these funds for anything else. Yet this is not right—to distribute everything down to the last kopek from the center. Once again I repeat: Give the money to the consumer, directly to the managers, and they will know what to do with it. Whether to develop land reclamation or livestock raising—that is their business. In this sense I am in full agreement with Comrade Shmelev, who spoke about the role of the banks. Once again we may recall the pre-revolutionary land bank which subsidized farmers and subsidized them only in accordance with their requests, their true needs, but not with those which were imposed upon them.

It seems to me that our economy is sorely lacking—and we have not even heard about this at this congress—about the importance of the credit system. Yet without it, how can we plan and distribute funds?

We have no legislation on ecology. Comrade Yablokov just spoke about this. Comrades, 100 countries already have [this legislation], over 100, but we still do not. And we will not have it in the near future, probably because we still have not established forms of ownership. What kind of economic and ecology laws can there be if we have not established one form of ownership or another? Any law is primarily a regulation of ownership. I believe it would be very beneficial to think about the proposal which was presented here, the proposal to, perhaps, sell land to private individuals. So what if 5 or, say, 6 percent of our land fund belongs to someone? Let the private owner compete, let him work, let him invest money in his endeavor.

Public opinion plays, and must play, a very large role in our ecology movement. Yet we have not learned to listen to it, this widespread movement. We ignore the opinion of very many competent people. They say that public opinion is formed by dilettantes. Nothing of the kind. The concept of the "public" includes also all sorts of

specialists and scientists, and it is often more knowledgeable than the departments. Let me present the following idea. I have engaged in questions of economics for quite a long time, but had my first encounter with the departments in 1962, when the project for flooding the entire West- Siberian lowland during construction of the Lower Ob GES was being developed. If the project had been implemented, all our present oil and gas riches would have been flooded over, or at least a significant portion of them. We would have flooded an area of 135,000 square kilometers, or an area equal to the size of Czechoslovakia. And now I across these projects once again.

Do you know, comrades, when it was easier to resolve these problems, then or now? As strange as it may seem, it was easier for me then. Why? Because then the departments, the bureaucrats, were not as refined as they are now. First of all, they were afraid of their superiors. Secondly, they were afraid of the press. Today our bureaucratic workers are not afraid of anything in the world. And so, when I suggested to one high-ranking official that we meet on television and discuss our ecological problems, he answered: "I do not want to participate in this show." There is an evaluation of public opinion and our participation in public life for you. At the same time, we are destroying a whole series of wonderful public endeavors. In Volgograd, for example, a group of engineers headed by Comrade Tregubov, each with a seniority of 30-40 years and over half of them heroes of socialist labor, is sending out to all addresses, including also to the Council of Ministers, wonderful and precise conclusions. This is a public commission of experts which, if convened in official order, would cost a huge amount of money. And it is all done most conscientiously. And so what? So nothing. All this gets bogged down somewhere. Can it be that we will again ignore the experience of these most knowledgeable builders? I have visited many countries, many hydrotechnical construction sites, and I believe that I have never anywhere encountered such specialists as this Volgograd group. (Bell rings). I will only be one more minute, a minute and a half. I would like to say that the Gosplan [State Planning Committee] is not working normally. The Gosplan is the headquarters staff of our socialist economic management. But what has it turned into? It does not command the ministries today. Rather, it is the ministries which command it. It is specifically through the Gosplan that our departments become a state. When the Volkhov GES was being planned, the Gosplan was charged with working out the initial data, but on this basis it was already giving contracts to syndicates and builders. Today the Gosplan has been turned into a distribution department. It distributes the budget and that is all. Thank you for your attention. (Applause).

A.-M.K. Brazauskas: Deputy Gvozdev has the floor. Comrade Suleymenov should get ready.

V.M. Gvozdev, brigade leader of an integrated mechanized brigade at the "Raspadskaya" mine, "Yuzhkuzbassugol" Production Association, Kemerovo Oblast, city of Mezhdurechensk (representing the CPSU): Comrades, it is very difficult to speak after those who have spoken before me. Honestly, it is difficult. But today we, the deputies from the Kuzbass, get no peace from the calls, telegrams, and letters. Our constituents demand very little, especially for the Kuzbass and Siberia. They demand that we get down to specific deeds and decisions as quickly as possible. In the mine it is much easier when there is solid ground under your feet, and a mountain overhead. Yes, many of the thoughts and problems which I wanted to touch upon have already been brought up several times. I will try not to be redundant, but nevertheless I will repeat some things. This speaks of the fact that we all have the same concerns, we all have the same problems. In short, the diagnosis has been established. It is time to take scalpel in hand and begin the operations. We cannot procrastinate. After all, we must survive.

I never thought that I would be elected a USSR people's deputy. And now one thought worries me: How to justify that trust, what to do so that my deeds and actions do not disappoint the expectations of my comrades in labor?

Our country is on the road of restructuring and renovation, but unfortunately the great number of unresolved tasks and problems is not declining, but rather increasing. Economic difficulties are becoming more acute. The shortage of goods is increasing. Interethnic conflicts are arising, and the crime rate is going up. And, thinking about all these burning problems, I say to myself: "Don't worry, Gvozdev, don't panic, don't get distressed!" No matter what happens, all the current difficulties are difficulties of a temporary nature. Yet this temporary disorder has somehow dragged on. However, it cannot be that the wonderful ideas of restructuring will not conquer; that the feelings of the working man which are being reborn—to be the master of his land—would dare be trampled and destroyed by someone.

Let us look truth in the eye. In recent years, on the wave of democratization and glasnost, discipline has been shaken quite a bit. Many good decisions remain on paper, since there is no strict executive discipline. Some have understood democracy in their own way: As all-permissiveness of their rights and negation of any, even the most elementary, responsibilities. (Applause). I believe that this was facilitated to some degree by certain publications in the newspapers, in journals, and in television broadcasts.

Our congress must adopt a law, and a workable law at that, which states that parallel with the development of democracy there must be a steady growth in responsibility both by the manager and the managed for strict and unconditional fulfillment of the adopted decisions.

I am often asked: "How do you see your main task as people's deputy elected from the CPSU?" I answer briefly: [I see it] in the struggle for implementing the

party platform, which was presented in the CPSU Central Committee's appeal to the people, and in its directives. In these documents I see everything that is needed for a better life of the simple Soviet people. And, if we speak honestly, I, a worker, have no heart for all those discussions about the fact that we supposedly need some other parties, factions, groups, or some other programs. In my opinion, disorder and vascillation, and especially lack of coordination in actions, never have and never will lead to anything good. Today as never before, we need unity and cohesion of all forces of restructuring. And what, deputies, should we focus our priority attention on?

I believe first of all on the adoption of laws, without which a legal state would be unthinkable. I am concerned that there are gross violations of the law under the guise of glasnost and democracy. The people who elected us expect much of us and of the congress decisions. We will not solve everything at once, but we have already approached the resolution of one important question—that of increasing the minimal amounts of pensions. That is wonderful.

We must continue to pursue specific decisions. People are tired of waiting. We must affirm through legislation the development of the social sphere, without which we cannot continue to live. And although numerous decisions have been adopted on this question, in practice the social sphere continues to be in a state of neglect, which evokes the just indignation of the workers.

Let me refer to several examples. My entire life has been associated with the Kuzbass. This is a mighty industrial complex with a well developed coal sector. It also has metallurgy, chemistry, and machine building. One-fifth of the country's coal is mined here. Millions of tonnes of cast iron, steel, rolled metal stock, and coke are produced here, as well as hundreds of thousands of tonnes of mineral fertilizers and cement. Iron ore is mined here.

However, the steady growth of the basic sectors of heavy industry in the Kuzbass has for many years been accompanied by a lagging behind in the development of the social sphere. Despite the fact that it is 13th in the republic in its volume of industrial production, the oblast is in 43rd place in housing provision, in 58th place in terms of children's preschool institutions, and in 70th place in terms of club facilities.

The problems of ecology and heat and water supply have reached a critical state in our basin, especially in the mining villages and settlements. In most of them even water is distributed by rationing. There is not enough of it to supply to the upper stories of houses. There is an acute shortage in many types of foodstuffs and goods. These are the unfortunate conditions in which the workers of the twice- medal winning Kuzbass live, including the residents of my native city of Mezhdurechensk.

Yet it is not only the Kuzbass that lives this way, but our entire rich region of Siberia and the Far East. Judging by everything, the ministries, pardon the expression, could spit on the social needs of the Siberians. As before, they continue to direct 70 percent of the capital investments toward production needs in top priority order. And as for the development of the social sphere, there is nothing good about it here. We might ask, what kind of a policy is this by the masters from the center, and primarily the Minugleprom [Ministry of the Coal Industry] managers, who do not notice all the acute social problems of the Kuzbass. We also believe that it is time we stopped going to Moscow for handouts, begging for all that is necessary for the normal life of the miners, metallurgists and chemists of the Kuzbass and Siberia. It is time we ourselves finally got the right to solve our own problems locally.

Here is what else I would like to say: These problems must be solved in such a way that those who occupy high positions do not flee to Moscow, and the miners themselves do not go away to warm regions. Rather, they must be solved in such a way that will make people have a great desire to come here to Siberia to work and live permanently.

Now, about the next question. Yes, we need cost accounting, but prudent and effective cost accounting. So that our prices would be brought in line with world prices. The way things are now, it will not do. We buy everything for millions, but sell our coal for kopeks.

Comrades, today the living standard, particularly that of the Kuzbass miners, is declining significantly. And here we cannot judge by wages alone, since they do not fully determine the living standard. For the money they earn, the miners cannot buy everyday items: valenki [felt boots], sheepskin coats, warm clothing and footwear which are so necessary in Siberia. There is a great shortage of refrigerators, washing machines and television sets.

Yet here we unexpectedly learn that for 1989 they have again reduced the funds for the Kuzbass on certain food and non-food items. People have felt this and express their bewilderment at such inequities in planning.

A difficult situation has arisen with food products, although we are taking measures for developing personal subsidiary farms and for overall improvement of the farm. Yet we cannot solve the food problem by ourselves in such an industrial region as our oblast, where less than 6 percent of the population works on the farm.

In short, there has long been an acute need for reviewing the prospects for our oblast's development, with all the problems that have accumulated there. The guidelines in doing so should not be the plans for continued growth of production. Rather, we must proceed from the situation which has arisen in terms of the living and working conditions of our people. (Applause).

A.-M.K. Brazauskas: Comrade Suleymenov has the floor. (Noise in the auditorium; voices).

O.O. Suleymenov, writer, first secretary of the Kazakhstan Union of Writers governing board, Alma-Ata (Ayaguzskiy Territorial Electoral District, Semipalatinsk Oblast): We, writers, speak not only about flowers, but more about the berries. Among the many aspects of restructuring for me the main one is the continuation of the process of decolonization, which was frozen in the 20's. It is taking place with all the manifestations characteristic for this process.

The originality of the historical situation is that the former parent state—Russia, on par with the other republics, has itself become a colony of the Center. We are seeing that which is customary in a new light. The interests of the state were always above the interests of the people and the individual. I was elected in Semipalatinsk Oblast, in the land of ancient historical tradition. That is where the great Kazakh writers were born, in these steppes and mountains—our Yasnaya Polyana, Mikhaylovskoye, Tarkhany. And it is in these very areas that the atomic test sites are now operating.

In the United States there is one test site, in China—one, while other countries test their bombs thousands of miles away from their territories, paying compensation to the atoll residents. In the USSR there are several test sites. The oldest of these is the one in Semipalatinsk. And it is also the most active—18 blasts a year. It is located practically in the center of the country. For 15 years, open tests were conducted on the ground and in the atmosphere. According to the most conservative estimates, charges with a total capacity of 2,500 Hiroshima bombs have been detonated in this region. Could all of this have taken place without some effect on the health of the population in these rayons and on the surrounding objects? Even if official specialists say so, we do not believe them. The experts of the public movement Nevada-Semipalatinsk have other, more frightening, data at their disposal. The Third Main Administration of the USSR Ministry of Health is keeping the materials from the studies a secret. Today, Hiroshima and Nagasaki have perhaps the highest indicator of average life expectancy in the world—thanks to the directed increase in the level of public health and the social sphere in these cities, and from them—throughout Japan. We must admit that our state has shown less compassion and respect for its own citizens. In the areas surrounding the test site, in the 40 years of testing, not a single health facility has been built at the expense of the center, not a single rural hospital has been equipped, not to mention anything else. The consequences of the open test blasts will long have an effect on the health of the entire country. In 1963, an agreement to cease testing in several spheres was finally signed. For the sake of fairness, we must pay due respect to the position of our scientists, and especially Academician Sakharov, who convinced the government to insist upon such an agreement. (Applause). This happened after the testing of the largest hydrogen bomb with a capacity of 60 megatons. Scientists realized what a nightmare for the world their invention holds. It combines both genius and evil, with increasing predominance of the latter. This combination is seen today even in the fact that Kurchatov and Lavrentiy Beriya were ordered to be the organizers of the Semipalatinsk test site.

Underground blasts are also unsafe, a fact which is evidenced by the emission of radioactive gases on 12 February of this year. The same thing also happened earlier, for example last summer. Thousands of children were afflicted in one day, with the hastily pronounced diagnosis of ORZ [ear-nose-throat disorders], nosebleeds, dizziness and other sympsoms which are rather characteristic of more than just a cold.

The world is changing. We have fewer enemies in the West and in the East. That means we have fewer defense expenditures. The Soviet world arsenals are overfilled. The nuclear defenses of the super powers have taken on colossal proportions and are capable of destroying those whom they are called upon to defend. Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's announcement at the London Guild Hall that our country is ceasing production of fission materials has added hopes for a nuclear-free 21st century, and is adding to the assurance that we are becoming a peaceful state. (Applause).

The fact that there is a new situation in the country, that the center already hears us, may be judged by the following. The birth of the Nevada-Semipalatinsk movement has led to a cessation of testing. For the fourth month the test sites are quiet. It is a fragile silence. We have great hopes that the government and the public anti-nuclear movement in the countries of the atomic club will hear us, will understand and support us, and will create conditions for signing a final agreement on banning testing in all spheres. (Applause).

After the 19th party congress it is now particularly evident that our development will ever more depend on the degree of openness of the dialogue between the people and the state, in the process of which at times different positions must be developed. We must remember that the country's troubles began at the beginning of the 20's specifically with the persecution of differences of opinion. In order for democratization and glasnost to continue, it is important to legislatively express the state attitude toward difference of opinion. We must acknowledge it to be a creative factor, rather than a hostile one. (Applause). Either in a resolution or in individual documents, we must condemn the crimes of the Stalinist clique against socialism, specifically such crimes as the physical extermination of the opposition. We must proclaim as being criminal the leftist theory and the practice of "rapid development", manifested in the rates and methods of sadly well-known reforms. How many times have the fresh winds of change turned to destructive hurricanes as a result of such "accelerations". The Kazakhs lost 350,000 lives in the war, yet in

the time of the so-called period of "rapid acceleration" they lost over 4 million. Every people can recall similar occurrences in its biography. History is senselessly repeated if its lessons go for naught. Finally, we must publish a "white", or more precisely, a "black" book of Stalin's tyranny, with data on all the republics.

We do not want to indiscriminately reject all of our history. After all, aside from the dark aspects, there were also general spiritual values. Along with the sorrowful there is also positive experience, which must be preserved and continued. Yet it is specifically for this reason that we must separate the pure from the bloody. Yes, millions perished without a voice. Today our memory shouts about them. Today we are in a position to condemn the tyranny. This is a testimony to the speed of development of our morals and legal consciousness. The Alma-Ata students and workers were the first in the country to hold unsanctioned meetings. If the Alma-Ata events of December 1986 had been broadly and democratically discussed and understood, perhaps 9 April would never have happened in Tbilisi. I believe it would be correct to examine the circumstances of the tragic Alma-Ata incident in light of a new humanistic approach. I am forwarding all the telegrams and letters to the appropriate Supreme Soviet commission, where I am prepared to present a speech on this question. And I call upon my fellow countrymen—Kazakhs, Russians, Germans, Ukrainians, Uygurs, Koreans, and the people of Kazakhstan who have experienced all this to understand the gravity of the moment, to believe that justice is possible if only we maintain our self-control and understanding of the value of our common interests.

How much pain has accumulated in the country, and how strong the return. There is not a single people whose consciousness does not contain bleeding wounds. Many of us have on our hands the shouting demands of the Turks-Meskhetin, the Crimean Tatars, the Abkhaz, Ingush, Chechen, and Gagauz. The Supreme Soviet commission on interethnic relations has much work ahead of it, and at least some of these difficulties must be overcome before the next congress. The Karabakh knot is being ever more tightly drawn. Ever broader factors are becoming involved: ethnic, religions, and others. Academician Likhachev rightly spoke of the role of culture in interethnic disputes. This role is limited without a full, overall knowledge of the history of the question. The unidirectional knowledge with which the peoples have been raised is the reason for many national insults and ambitions. We must publish a special series of collections and documents on these heated topics. Culture presupposes taking steps toward each other. Such a collection should include, aside from objective historical information, also the harsh truth about Sumgait, and the information about the crash of the airplane from Baku which was carrying 50 Azerbaijani soldiers who had volunteered to help their neighbors in need and were on their way to help the earthquake disaster victims. These fellows wanted to make their contribution to the cause of restoring friendship, and they contributed what they could—their lives. There is no memorial to them. Their names did not resound in the press. Only their mothers know of their fate. There are probably many such unknown cases of nobility, and we must constantly work to publicize them. (Applause). So that we will learn to sympathize with each other. What happened in Uzbekistan was no accident. What happened in Bashkiria was no accident. It is a sign, a painful, terrible metaphor which we have been given to read. One thing is clear: We cannot turn up the pressure when there are so many hole-ridden pipelines in the country. The concentrated fuel of national and social dissatisfaction flows toward the roads along which trains carrying children pass. Let us not leave a legacy of bitterness for our children and grandchildren. We have earned the right, and they simply must be happy. Thank you. (Applause).

A.-M.K. Brazauskas: Comrades a few announcements before we end our meeting. I have some notes here. Deputies who did not have time to speak at our congress ask whether their proposals will be included in the stenographic record of the congress. Yes, they will be included. Therefore, since our congress is already coming to an end, I ask that you submit your presentations to the secretariat in written form. That is the first thing. Second, the organizational meeting of the commission investigating the case of Comrades Gdlyan and Ivanov will be held at 1515 today in the building of the editorial commission.

M.S. Gorbachev: Not the case.

A.-M.K. Brazauskas: That is how it is written. Of course: Not the case, but the question. Also, Aleksandr Nikolayevich Yakovlev asked me to say that the commission for evaluating the agreement of 1939 will meet after the evening session of the congress in the Granovit Palace.

We have also received a proposal from a large number of people's deputies—more than 200. They propose a procedural question: How to organize roll-call voting. The Presidium consulted on the matter. The procedure is new, and probably we will not have time to assimilate it in one day. Therefore, it is proposed that we analyze this system and use it at the next congress if possible.

And some more information, very briefly. Aside from the announced speaker, there were 89 people participating in the discussions. Of these, 32 were from union republics. From the autonomous republics—there are notes here that there were very few—there were seven, from the autonomous oblasts—2, from the oblasts of the Russian Federation—20 speakers, and from public organizations—27. Thus, deputies from more or less all groups and all territories were represented. Now we have proposals on speeches 2-3 minutes in length. The presidium proposes that the time for such presentations be given at the end of today's evening meeting, because now there is little time and many commissions will be

working. So, the comrades who have signed up will have an opportunity to speak at the end of our evening session. Shall we begin the discussion now?

Voices: No.

A.-M.K. Brazauskas: Who is in favor of not beginning the discussion? I ask for a vote. Thank you. Who is opposed? It has been decided.

From the floor: I have an announcement.

A.-M.K. Brazauskas: We will yield the floor for an announcement.

Deputy (did not introduce himself): The group of people's deputies—241 people—who proposed the roll-call vote will conduct it without preliminary permission. The secretariat has the materials. Whoever did not get them may do so. Despite the opinion of others, we want the entire country to know our opinion. Many are dissatisfied, and therefore we propose to all who are not afraid to say their name and share the responsibility for any decisions which will be adopted—they will satisfy some, and not others—to join in our opinion. It will be published and circulated in the press. Thank you for your attention.

(Recess).

8 June 1989. Kremlin Palace of Congresses. 1600.

USSR Supreme Soviet Chairman M.S. Gorbachev presiding.

M.S. Gorbachev: Honorable comrade deputies! We continue the work of our congress. As we agreed yesterday, we will examine the following questions on the agenda: The first question is that of ratification of the USSR Council of Ministers chairman.

As you know, the USSR Supreme Soviet has appointed Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov to serve as chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers. Yesterday we heard his speech and began our discussion. I introduce for your consideration the proposal to ratify Comrade Ryzhkov in the office of chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers. Do the deputies have any questions for Comrade Ryzhkov?

Yesterday, those who heard this discussion remember that the Supreme Soviet held a rather thorough discussion. I believe the participants in the debates, both today and probably tomorrow, will express many of their ideas, critical comments and evaluations addressed at the government, and not only the government. Nevertheless, within the framework and within the context of such an approach to this question, I would like to ask you: May I present my proposal for a vote, or will there be some questions here too... So, yes? That is the attitude? Good.

From the floor: There were some written questions for Nikolay Ivanovich....

M.S. Gorbachev: They were about the speech, yes?

From the floor: Yes.

M.S. Gorbachev: I believe we have decided that on the questions which were asked in connection with Nikolay Ivanovich's speech we will give him a chance to answer at the end of the discussion. Is that right, comrades?

From the auditorium: Yes.

M.S. Gorbachev: That is right. As that is the general attitude, comrades, I present the question for a vote. Who is in favor of ratifying Comrade Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov as chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers? Please raise your cards. Please lower them.

Who is opposed? I request a count.

M.S. Gorbachev: While the comrades are counting up the results...I would like to announce that we in the Supreme Soviet have agreed that each presiding chairman will conduct the meeting while seated, which is generally accepted. There were some requests to consider this fact addressed here to me, and not just to me alone, so that the presiding chairman does not hang over the hall and, pardon me, does not move onto it. What do you think, comrades?

From the hall: (Indistinct).

M.S. Gorbachev: We have to agree here, so that there will be no misunderstanding. That is so, is it not?

From the hall: Yes.

M.S. Gorbachev: Good.

A.G. Kostenyuk: Honorable deputies, there were 59 votes against.

M.S. Gorbachev: Who abstained?

A.G. Kostenyuk: There were 87 deputies abstaining.

M.S. Gorbachev: Thus, the Congress of People's Deputies ratifies Comrade Ryzhkov in the position of chairman of the Council of Ministers. (Applause). Comrade Ryzhkov asks to speak.

N.I. Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers (representing the CPSU): Honorable people's deputies! Allow me to express my sincere thanks for ratifying me in this high state office of our country.

This is the second time I have been appointed to this office. However, I must say that the process of this appointment differs sharply from the old practice of

making appointments to high posts in our country. I see this as the result of the great changes that have taken place in our country in recent years, in the years of restructuring, which have allowed us specifically to discuss on a democratic basis all the questions of our life and our society and to appoint the leaders of our state.

The discussion of questions at the congress, the numerous meetings, and the inquiries which we received during these days indicate that a great number of problems have come to a head in our country, problems we must solve. I believe it is specifically the congress which will determine the basic directions along which our society and our entire country must progress.

I understand what a difficult time it is in which I am assuming the leadership of the new government. I understand what great tasks face the country, and I understand how difficult it will be to resolve them.

Yet I am deeply convinced that if we can correctly select the line, select the correct policy both in a strategic and in a tactical plane, we will be able to solve the principle questions that have come to a head in our society and which were so heatedly discussed these days at our congress. I hope that we will work in close contact with the Supreme Soviet, which will be working continuously, as well as with its commissions, its committees, and with all the people's deputies. The executive authority will clearly implement this line, which will be ratified by our country's highest legislative organ. This I firmly promise you.

In conclusion I thank you once again. I thank all the Soviet people, who are showing me such great trust today. Thank you. (Applause).

M.S. Gorbachev: The next question. The election of the USSR Committee for Constitutional Control. In accordance with the Constitution, the USSR Committee for Constitutional Control is elected by the USSR Congress of People's Deputies for a 10-year term from among specialists in the field of politics and law. It includes a chairman, a deputy chairman, and 21 committee members, including representatives from each of the union republics.

Honorable comrade deputies, we are very careful in our approach to ensure that this very important organ, which is formulated by and directly subordinate to the congress, is composed of respected and competent people, as we associate the success of our endeavor on the road to formulating a legal socialist state with the work of this organ. Many of you, not only Communists but also non-party affiliated deputies, were present at the meeting of the party group, and at that time this topic was within the field of vision, specifically the question of membership and nominations of candidates for chairman. There were some rather convincing conclusions expressed as to the need for having an authoritative and competent person at the head of this new and very important organ. Therefore, I am now presenting the proposal to elect Comrade Vladimir Nikolayevich Kudryavtsev, who is currently vice-president of the USSR Academy of Sciences, to the position of chairman of the USSR Committee for Constitutional Control. I also propose that we elect Comrade Boris Mikhaylovich Lazarev, currently section chief of the USSR Academy of Sciences State and Law Institute, to serve as deputy chairman.

You have been given the materials on the candidates for Committee membership, as well as a draft of the resolution on election of the Committee for Constitutional Control. I hope you have had a chance to acquaint yourselves with them. As you can see, we propose including representatives from all the union republics and leading specialists from the field of politics and law in the membership of the committee. That is my brief speech. What thoughts, comments, or judgements do the deputies have? Please....

N.N. Vorontsov, doctor of biological sciences, chief scientific associate at the USSR Academy of Sciences N.K. Koltsov Institute of Developmental Biology, Moscow (representing the scientific societies and associations under the USSR Academy of Sciences): I would like to say that the list of members itself and the chairman of the proposed new organ—not a single person—evokes no objections from me. That is, we see here, as far as one can judge by these biographical data, specialists either in the field of jurisprudence or in history. That is all fine. Yet I have one principle comment regarding the membership of this important organ and regarding the subsequent organs.

Our society is made up of members of the Communist Party, as well as non-party members. I did not see here, among the proposed candidacies, a single non-party member. I have one question: Are there any doctors of juridical sciences in our country who are not party members? Are there any specialists in the field of state and law who are not party members? I am in no way trying to question this membership. Moreover, I will vote for this make-up, but I would like these comments to be taken into consideration in formulating other organs of the congress. It seems to me that we must reflect, at least to a certain degree, the make-up of society in formulating the leading organs. We in the USSR do not have a single minister who is not a party member. We have or practically have, as far as I know, no deputy ministers who are not party members. We practically do not have any directors of large enterprises who are not party members. This does not indicate any disrespect on my part to the majority of party members who are present here, but we must consider the fact that our society is heterogeneous. And we must reflect this heterogeneity, at least to a small degree, also in the make-up of the leading organs of the country. Thank you for your attention. (Applause).

M.S. Gorbachev: Please introduce yourself.

V.I. Kolotov, editor of the newspaper VYBORGSKIY KOMMUNIST, city of Vyborg (Vyborg territorial electoral district, RSFSR): I am not personally acquainted with Vladimir Nikolayevich Kudryavtsev. However, our acquaintance by correspondence was made long ago, particularly in the period of the pre-electoral campaign, as well as in connection with the so-called case of Gdlyan and Ivanov. Comrade Kudryavtsev, I feel, is a a juridically trained person. His biographical report attests to this fact. But here is what puts me on guard. In his speeches on television and in his articles in the press, Vladimir Nikolayevich clearly exhibits a desire to always please the authorities, to always be in harmony with the official opinion. This cannot be concealed, it seems to me, by any outwardly strong and supposedly independent phrase. Therefore, I express my dissent against this candidacy and my mistrust of Comrade Kudryavtsev. We have long grown tired of yes-men. A person with such a character, it seems to me, cannot be the chairman of such a vitally important organ as the Committee for Constitutional Control, even if he is super-educated in law. That is my opinion. (Applause).

M.S. Gorbachev: Please.

R.V. Gudaytis, writer, literary consultant for the Lithuanian SSR Union of Writers, Vilnius (Kapsukskiy national-territorial electoral district, Lithuanian SSR): Comrade deputies, you will probably view my proposal not to create a Committee for Constitutional Control as an obstruction or an effort to hinder a pre-outlined scenario for the conclusion of the congress. Yet nevertheless, expressing the will of my constituents and the citizens of Lithuania, I must say: A hastily created committee will inevitably become an instrument of pressure on the national rebirth of the union republics, a pressure on their sovereignty.

We are not even reassured by the high juridical qualification of the Chairman and the committee members, including the authoritative and respected Lithuanian specialist Stachekas, with apologetics to the centralism of the unitarian state which retains the most important peculiarities of the Stalinist imperialist model. Reassure us and tell us that the USSR Committee for Constitutional Control will not become the "legal" guarantor for those forces who want to grip national problems with an iron hand. Reassure us and say that the Committee will not speak out against the creation of new democratic constitutions in the republics, will not challenge the rights of nations to their own land and, most importantly, to their own self determination. No outside force has the right to intervene in the constitutional position of a certain republic. No institution can put itself above the interests of the people of my Latvia, and moreover stop the effect of the laws of a sovereign republic, specifically the recently adopted amendments to the Lithuanian SSR Constitution.

As a test we might propose the amendment to Article 125 of the USSR Constitution: "The Committee for Constitutional Control is elected from among the number of specialists in law, comprised of 15 chairmen and 15 committee members from each union republic. The leadership is determined by the principle of strict sequence order. If the sovereignty of a union republic is infringed upon, it has the right of veto".

Let this serve as food for thought for the future, yet the present formulation is unacceptable to us. The overwhelming majority of the Lithuanian delegation, as well as a large group of deputies from Latvia and Estonia, address the congress with the following petition.

"Keeping in view the fact that:

first—the congress has defined a constitutional crisis in the form of internal contradictions between the Basic Law which dates back to the time of stagnation and the need for creating a new USSR Constitution, rather than implementing control over adherence to the outdated one;

secondly—as yet there is no law on constitutional control in the USSR;

third!y—the powers of the USSR Committee for Constitutional Control as they are presented in the Constitution with the corresponding amendments allow this organ to infringe upon the sovereign rights of the union republics;

fourth—already last fall the population of Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia, through collective protests which gathered around 4 million signatures, expressed its disapproval of the latest undemocratic corrections and amendments to the USSR Constitution;

fifth—even now the voters have entrusted us with their concern for the sovereignty of our republics.

We consider the elections of the USSR Committee for Constitutional Control to be inexpedient, and we will not participate in them." Thank you. (Applause).

A.O. Dobrovolskiy, engineer-designer at a design bureau for precision electronic machine building, Minsk (Minsk-Lenin territorial electoral district, Minsk Oblast, Belorussian SSR): In order to make a responsible and important decision, we must know not only our own opinion, but also the opinion of others, of specialists. Therefore, I took upon myself the responsibility of calling to the city of Minsk and consulting on the question of the membership of the Committee for Constitutional Control. I would like to express my opinion and the opinion of the legal community. I gave the jurists half an hour for discussion. This candidacy was discussed also at the BSSR Academy of Sciences Philosophy and Law Institute, as well as at the juridical faculty of Belorussian State University. In general, all the jurists whom I was able to survey spoke out against the candidacy of Comrade Yemenov who was nominated from the Belorussian SSR. Several different sources proposed

another name—that of Valeriy Guryevich Tikhin, a doctor of juridical sciences and pro-rector of Belorussian State University. This nomination was signed by 18 people's deputies from the Belorussian SSR, and I am handing it over to the Presidium with the belief that the opinion of the juridical community of the city of Minsk—the center of juridical science in Belorussia—must necessarily be taken into consideration. I insist that a separate vote be taken on the candidacy from Belorussia. Thank you.

Z.G. Balayan, LITERATURNAYA GAZETA special correspondent to the Armenian SSR, Yerevan (Askeranskiy national-territorial district, Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast): The Constitution—the Basic Law—was written, as we know, in a lapidary fashion, and there we may include, as they say, only that which bears certain weight. Naturally, there are appropriate codes of laws and commentaries to the Constitution to allow to us understand all the details. The publishing house "Politicheskaya literatura" [political literature] in 1982 published a book entitled "The USSR Constitution, A Political-Legal Commentary". The following text appears on page 250 of this book: "An autonomous oblast is named after the name of the people who have selected the autonomous oblast as the form of realization of their right to self determination". Vladimir Nikolayevich Kudryavtsev, Vadim Konstantinovich Sobakin, and Anatoliy Ivanovich Lukyanov participated in the collective authorship of this code of laws, this political-legal commentary on the USSR Constitution. Seven years have passed since that time. As you know, the only oblast—the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast—in violation of the Constitution bears its name not by the national indicator, but by the geographical. As you know, there is no such nationality as the Nagorno-Karabakhs. There are Armenians, Azerbaijanis, Kurds, Talysh, Greeks, and Russians living there... I quote once again: "The autonomous oblast is named after the name of the people who have selected the autonomous oblast as the form of realization of their right to self determination". I would like to ask the candidate for chairman of the Committee for Constitutional Control, Vladimir Nikolayevich Kudryavtsev, a professor, a vice-president of the Academy of Sciences, and the director of the State and Law Institute for 15 years, to give an explanation of this question. Thank you.

M.S. Gorbachev: Comrades, perhaps we can agree to keep our comments to a maximum of 2-3 minutes, yes?

From the auditorium: Yes.

S.B. Kalagin, engineer-adjuster at the Perm Ya.M. Sverdlov production association "Motorostroitel," Perm (Sverdlov territorial district, Perm Oblast): Comrades! Now we are to elect the Committee for Constitutional Control now, but we are not to ratify it. This seems very significant to me, at least in terms of the candidacy of the committee chairman. At one of the meetings I heard several names of well-known jurists mentioned from the audience. I propose that the congress once again repeat these names, discuss them, and only after doing so conduct the election for committee chairman. Thank you.

M.S. Gorbachev: Very well. So, I repeat, recommended for election to the office of committee chairman are Comrade Vladimir Nikolayevich Kudoyavtsev, academician, vice-president of the USSR Academy of Sciences, doctor of juridical sciences, and professor. And to the office of deputy committee chairman—Comrade Boris Mikhaylovich Lazarev, section head at the USSR Academy of Sciences State and Law Institute, doctor of juridical sciences, and professor. Is this what you wanted? Or not this? That means I did not understand the question. Then excuse me, I will be more precise. But for now other comrades will speak.

D.A.A. Kerimov, department chairman at the Academy of Social Sciences under the CPSU Central Committee, Moscow (Shakhbuzskiy national-territorial district, Nakhichevan ASSR): Honorable comrade deputies! I did not intend to speak, but the comment by one of the comrades regarding the fact that Kudryavtsev supposedly "makes up" to his superiors, as was stated not very elegantly, simply amazed me and evoked a sense of strange bewilderment. I have known Vladimir Nikolayevich for many years. We are colleagues. We have worked together. We get along as colleagues and as friends. And never in my life have I noticed that he has ever "made up" to anyone. It is simply amazing to say such things. I must say that Vladimir Nikolayevich is one of the leading Soviet jurists. He is known throughout the world. He is a very decent and very interesting and original man. Therefore, I ask you to listen to the voice of a jurist who knows his colleagues quite well, and primarily Vladimir Nikolayevich. Thank you. (Applause).

A.M. Yakovlev, doctor of juridical sciences, section head at the USSR Academy of Sciences State and Law Institute, Moscow (representing the USSR Academy of Sciences): Actually, comrades, I understand all the concern which is being shown in this auditorium regarding the membership and functions of the Committee for Constitutional Control. Yet I would like to alleviate the suspicions that the Committee for Constitutional Control will somehow stand in the way of positive and constructive changes to our Constitution. We must not confuse two things, comrades—respect for that which is accepted as the Constitution, and the possibility of its goal-oriented, planned amendment by democratic means. These are two equally existing functions. Therefore, I wanted to alleviate any suspicions against this committee that supposedly it will take a stand against development of the Constitution. At the same time, we will be voting for a commission on developing a new Constitution. We cannot say that it will be an anti-constitutional commission. That is the first thing.

Secondly, I have known Vladimir Nikolayevich for a relatively short time—since about 1954. I myself, as you can see, am a rather elderly person and must say that I was hurt by the comments to the effect that he "makes up" to someone. I will tell you directly. Of course, all of us, as they say, are children of our time, why deny it? But for Kudryavtsev ever to have lied, or to have made up to someone or to have been dishonest in regard to his colleagues, as well as on principle questions?.. We do not always have the courage to say the truth in time. We have not always risen to the level of, say, Academician Sakharov, who was the only one to speak the truth when we remained silent. All this is true. And of this we are all, perhaps, guilty. But that he ever said anything against his conscience or against truth and honor—that never happened.

I will cite only two episodes. Even before our current president was the secretary general of the party, Vladimir Nikolayevich Kudreyavtsev, I, and a number of other colleagues raised the question of how shocking the state of affairs was in our fight against crime. At that time we sent a report to our current president, where we wrote about that which today, finally, we are beginning to overcome: The crime rate is not recorded, the militia is doing nothing, the courts are powerless, two people's assessors headed by a judge form that very same, so to speak, perfect troika with which we have galloped through the terrible years...

All these questions we raised even then, but excuse us, we raised them in a report, because, of course, no one would have published such, so to speak, jibberish. And at that time the current president placed the following resolution on this—I believe that this is already not an official secret: "I believe that the questions which are presented here are questions raised by honest communists on principle questions of our justice system". And this was forwarded to the minister of internal affairs, the general procurator, and the supreme court justice with the request to look into the matter and develop specific proposals for improving the work of our criminal justice system.

Well, as is always the case, of course, some things were done and some things were not. You might recall that the improvement began with registration. At least, the idea emerged of creating a single investigative committee, which we will today decide. That is the first episode. Here is the second episode. You know all of our infamous ukases and the shameful Article 11. And I will tell you one more secret here. Of course, it would have been correct to stand up and announce to the world about what an anti-constitutional article this was. But I must tell you that our future chairman of the Committee for Constitutional Control, if he is elected of course, stated on the second or third day at our country's highest party forum, at the Politburo, that this article was no good, and that it must be changed. To this he received verbal agreement and a blessing. I believe that the members of the highest party forum who are present here can confirm this episode.

M.S. Gorbachev: That is correct.

A.M. Yakovlev: There, you see, I have a witness to back me up, as they say. In short, I believe that in Kudryavtsev we are getting a man who, by the logic of his thinking, by his entire biography, and by his scientific authority was created specifically for occupying this office. That is my opinion. (Applause).

A.M. Obolenskiy, engineer-designer at the USSR Academy of Sciences Kolsk Scientific Center Polar Geophysical Institute, city of Apatity in Murmansk Oblast (Leningrad rural national-territorial district): Honorable comrades. I would like to direct your attention to the fact that this is our last chance to elect someone at the congress. The Constitution is compiled in such a way that we had the opportunity to elect the chairman of the Supreme Soviet, and the only place in which we can manifest our choice is the Committee for Constitutional Control. All other positions we merely ratify. I call on you to approach this with all responsibility. Once again we are being offered elections without competition.

First of all, I consider it disrespectful when we are given outlines of resolutions which are not signed by anyone. Anonymous, once again. We do not know their authorship. That about which much has been said is unclear.

Secondly, I would like to point out that the [time limit] Regulations are being systematically violated. We get these documents just before the vote is held. It is good that the comrade from Belorussia had enough time to call his constituents, evidently during the lunch break, and to consult with them somehow and learn their opinion. We elect these people for a term of 10 years. If we had a competition for the office of chairman, there would be two or three candidates here. Each one would get up to the podium and answer our questions. He would have to fight for our votes. I, for one, have questions to ask. I believe many of us do. What is Comrade Kudryavtsev's attitude toward those drafts of laws which were recently adopted by ukase? What is his attitude toward the revelry of departmental standard-setting in our country? And there are many other questions which might be asked. I point out that he is not a novice in legal work, and consequently, as one who has occupied key posts—he was an institute director—he bears certain responsibility for the quality of laws in our country which have now been adopted. We should talk about this.

I believe that now, under such conditions, we do not have the right to elect the Committee for Constitutional Control. The Constitution does not specify that it must be elected specifically at the first congress. Therefore, I submit the outline of the following resolution for your consideration. The USSR Congress of People's Deputies resolution "On the question of electing the Committee for Constitutional Control". Having reviewed the proposals of the congress Presidium on the personnel make-up of the committee, the congress notes a violation in the

regulations of work of the congress: The draft of the resolution was handed out to the deputies on the day of voting, 8 June. The information presented to the deputies was brief, the biographies and references presented were insufficient for election to such an important organ, especially considering the long term of its tenure—10 years. Considering the above-mentioned facts, the congress resolves:

First. To put off examination of the question of electing the Committee for Constitutional Control to the Fall of 1989, to the second Congress of People's Deputies. (Applause).

Second. The elections of the committee and especially its leadership must necessarily be conducted on a competitive basis after thorough discussion of the candidacies.

Third. We must publicize the recommendations of the Presidium on the personnel make-up of the committee for the purpose of open public discussion of the proposed candidacies.

Fourth. We must entrust the Committee for Legislation and Law and Order to verify the comments of the workers on the proposed candidacies and to bring them to the attention of all the deputies.

Fifth. We must give groups of deputies in certain numbers (well, the number may be specified), I propose no less than 100 persons, the right to nominate additional candidates to the Committee for Constitutional Control.

That is all I have to say. Thank you. I would only like to add that this is introduced in the order of a legislative initiative on the basis of Article 114 of the Constitution. Each of us has the right to such legislative initiative. Therefore, I ask the chairman to put my proposal to a vote. (Applause).

K.V. Kogan, chief of the thermotechnical laboratory at the "Estrybprom" association, Tallinn (Tallin-Kalinin national-territorial district, Estonian SSR): Honorable deputies! I am sorry for the delay, but I would like to express my opinion on the question under discussion. One of the deputies from the Baltic who spoke signed his name here for all three republics, for all the voters there. There is a clearly apparent desire and attempt to shorten the reach of the yet uncreated Committee so that it will not be able to review matters in the union republics. It is assumed that this, perhaps, will infringe upon someone's rights. Yet it seems to me that the Committee is being created to guarantee against infringement on the rights of everyone living in our country. In connection with this I would like to say to you that already now the rights of many residents in these republics are being infringed upon. Such laws have been adopted, and I would like the Committee for Constitutional Control to begin its work with the Baltic, and specifically—with Estonia. (Applause).

I would like the Committee to review the correspondence of the USSR Constitution with all the amendments which were adopted in Estonia on 16 November 1988. I would like it to review the constitutionality of that conception which was adopted on the basis of all these amendments to the Constitution. I would like this Committee to determine the legality of our laws—the so-called laws on language, where education in one language is guaranteed, and in another—merely allowed. Moreover, the knowledge of a language is still the basis for concluding and extending labor agreements. That is the main thing. And finally, I would like to point out the following documents. This, it seems to me, is work specifically for the Committee. I will permit myself to quote them.

The newspaper SOVETSKAYA ESTONIA, 12 October 1988: "One other moment which, to put it mildly, causes puzzlement. On 5 October the newspaper NOORTE KHYAEL published an interview with the chief of the People's Front security service, A. Evele, who said that they have 80 persons who have mastered karate and judo, plus 400 guards".

Secondly, the newspaper SOVETSKAYA ESTONIA, 20 October 1988. I quote: "You, Comrade Zaytsev, are concerned about the creation of a security service within the Estonian People's Front. Well, you are not alone. This concern has resounded in several other newspaper publications, as for example in the newspaper VIRU SYNA on 7 October of this year, which cited the outrageous case where during the Estonian People's Front Congress the guards did not allow Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium Chairman A. Ryuytel into the press center".

The next item. The newspaper SOVETSKAYA LATVIA, 6 October 1988, V. Steshenko: "I will say honestly, it is difficult for me to imagine how to look for mutual understanding with people who at their meetings express and applaud racist misanthropic views, and who train the violence groups about which V. Turnis spoke. He himself is leaving, but what is he leaving behind for us? Storm troopers?"

The newspaper ATMODA dated 29 May 1989: "The question of creating people's detachments of the Latvian People's Front for protecting public order was discussed for the first time at the governing board level. The leadership of the group which will work on these questions was placed on Int Upmatsis". Next...

M.S. Gorbachev: Your time is up.

Ye.V. Kogan: One second, literally... The newspaper VETSPILSITAS ZINES, and I quote. "Today, when our Soviet society is concerned about the tyranny of the army, and specifically the free reign of tanks, the average Soviet man has the overwhelming desire to learn how to fight this peculiar defender of peace and restructuring. Already in the second issue of IZVESTIYA STAROGO

GODA they began quoting the outstanding book "Military Basic Training". And today we have decided not to break the tradition which was started. Young comrades, read these quotes and use the knowledge which you obtain in the struggle for Soviet rule".

Finally, my request. I ask that a group of independent jurists be created which would get to the bottom of all these matters. I believe that this could be the very first and very worthwhile work for the new Committee for Constitutional Control. I would not like to argue now about the election procedures, but the need for such a commission or committee has grown very acute, dear comrades. Thank you for your attention.

A.A. Plotyaneks, professor at Latvian P. Stuchka State University Riga (Yelgavskiy national-territorial district, Latvian SSR): Honorable people's deputies! Honorable Chairman! The country's leading jurists and political scientists are being proposed for membership in the Committee for Constitutional Control. We announce that we have complete trust and respect toward these candidacies, including also toward Academician Vladimir Nikolayevich Kudryavtsev as the future chairman of this Committee. Yet at the same time, the conditions and circumstances under which this question is being resolved are rather unique. The proposals of the USSR people's deputies to introduce changes and amendments into the USSR Constitution are as yet not only unsubstantiated, but we do not even have a Constitutional Commission yet. The USSR Constitution of 1977 remains in effect, and the standards of the reorganizational law of 1 December of last year are embedded into it as individual fragments. Today the effective union Constitution contains an abundance of problems and contradictions.

The development of a new USSR Constitution still lies ahead. At the same time, in order to promote restructuring in the union republics, in the very near future we must introduce rather significant changes into the republic constitutions. This process is taking place, specifically, in all three of the Baltic republics and in other union republics as well. The new constitutional standards which are today being born in the union republics cannot coincide in meaning and in letter with the standards of the old union Constitution. The task of the USSR Committee for Constitutional Control is to implement control over the correspondence of the USSR Constitution with the constitutions of the union republics. Thus, the Committee will be called upon to "measure by a single level" the Constitutions of the union republics, achieving the elimination from them of all innovations for which we have created no normative analog at the federation level. But, of course, we will have to do so.

You might object: What is the hurry? We will adopt the new USSR Constitution, and then we will take up the constitutions of the union republics. Such an approach, unfortunately, is fraught with many dangers.

First of all, the all-union market, republic cost accounting, the transition to economic methods of management, the saturation of the market with goods, and many of our everyday needs which have been discussed from this rostrum, require their own solution. Economists are proposing various prescriptions for curing these economic ills, but without a change in the constitutions of the union republics these prescriptions will not work, and treatment is impossible.

Secondly, the logical process of renovating constitutional legislation in the socialist federative state must begin at the republic level, and the most successful innovations must then be generalized at the level of the union Constitution. What is the answer? We see the answer in the congress giving a limited interpretation to Article 125 of the USSR Constitution. We present for your consideration the draft of the following statute—it is very short:

"Resolution of the USSR Congress of Deputies on the order of application of Article 125 of the USSR Constitution."

"The USSR Congress of People's Deputies resolves: to specify that the right of the USSR Committee for Constitutional Control granted by Article 125 of the USSR Constitution to stop implementation of normative-legal statutes which contradict the USSR Constitution or the USSR Law, does not extend to the Constitutions of the union republics". (Applause).

What does this entail? This is not a disparagement of the role of the USSR Committee for Constitutional Control. It will be able to present its conclusions on the correspondence or lack of correspondence of the constitution of any union republic to the USSR Constitution.

The USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium will implement constitutional control. Our congress will retain the last word on these questions, but at the same time consideration will be given to the fact that the adoption of a union republic constitution, as well as the introduction of changes into it, remains the sovereign right of the union republic. And to give a certain, even the most competent federative organ, the right to stop its action, means to deprive the republic of its sovereignty with a single stroke of the pen.

Our concern is not unfounded, particularly after yesterday's speech by Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov about the upcoming activity of the USSR government, which places the emphasis specifically on the unitarian, and not the federative, organization of our state. Giving the Committee for Constitutional Control the power to sanction or refute the Basic Laws of the union republics is a blow to the very idea of a legal state. A large part of the people's deputies from the Baltic republics (and not only them) who have promised their constituents that they would defend the reorganizational laws of their republics, want to and will keep this promise. Today we are creating a state organ which will be able to "burn"

many new articles in the republic constitutions. What should we do? To vote against, to abstain, or to leave the auditorium... Yet we are in favor of this membership, we are in favor of this Committee. Thank you for your attention. (Applause).

Yu.V. Golik, deacon of the juridical faculty at Kemerovo State University, Kemerovo (Central Territorial-Electoral district, Kemerovo Oblast): First a few words about the Committee for Constitutional Control. Comrades! The Committee for Constitutional Control, or our variant of the constitutional court, is just as necessary to us as air. We have been striving for this for many years, and therefore I consider to be inadmissable the efforts (under supposedly democratic slogans) to torpedo the creation of this Committee. (Applause). In general, of course, the ideal variant is for this Committee to begin work tomorrow, or at least—on Monday. After all, we are suffocating from departmental standard-setting. And the faster we put an end to it, the easier it will be for all of us to breathe. I must say a few words also about that ultimatum, in essence, which our colleagues from the Baltic have issued, and not for the first time. Comrades, any effort to present an ultimatum to the Congress of People's Deputies is simply inadmissable. (Applause). We and we alone are capable of deciding all the questions which stand before us. We may be three times in disagreement with the general opinion. We may refute it, but we may not present an ultimatum.

And the final point: About the possible candidacy of Academician Kudryavtsev to the office of chairman of the Committee for Constitutional Control. I know Vladimir Nikolayevich Kudryavtsev, though not personally, from his works dating back to November of 1969. I specify this time so precisely for the simple reason that this was when I first read one of his books. I met him personally only here, at the congress. Therefore, I cannot be accused of any sympathies or antipathies built on personal experience. I consider him to be a principled man, and in essence, an ideal candidate for this position. (Applause).

M.S. Gorbachev: Deputy Tarazevich, Belorussia.

G.S. Tarazevich, chairman of the Belorussian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, Minsk (Molodechnenskiy national-territorial district, Belorussian SSR): First of all, I would like to express my opinion and support the opinion already expressed here about the fact that, of course, it is specifically at this congress that we must (and really must) elect the Committee for Constitutional Control. And now about the candidacy of Yevmenov from Belorussia. I know Comrade Yevmenov, and know him very well. He is a highly learned man, a very knowledgeable specialist, a social scientist, philosopher, and doctor of sciences with extensive experience in public work. He worked in Komsomol and party organs, spent much time in teaching work, worked in international organizations, specifically UNESCO, engaged specifically in problems of public relations, and has a good knowledge of international law. At the present time he is working in the Academy of Sciences, where he heads up the section on information on social sciences of our Belorussian Academy of Sciences. He is engaged in the study of public relations in the current, very complex, period of restructuring. He is principled, honest, and fair. We believe that he would be a worthy representative of Belorussia in the Committee for Constitutional Control, and I ask that you support his candidacy.

D.G. Smirnov, design engineer at the production association "KhEMZ", Kharkov (Kharkov-Moscow territorial electoral district, Kharkov Oblast): Comrades! I also have no pretensions against the make-up of the committee or its proposed chairman. However, I generally share the concern of the deputy who spoke before Comrade Tarazevich. Unfortunately, if we read the USSR Constitution closely, we will see that Article 125, which defines the activity of this committee, states: "The organization and order of activity of the USSR Committee for Constitutional Control is determined by the Law on Constitutional Control in the USSR". Yet there is no such law. How can we now create a committee which will not know how it should act and what it should do, other than be guided by general phrases from the Constitution? Let us put off this question for 6 months. Let us bring to Moscow these people who have been proposed for membership in the Committee for Constitutional Control. They will work for these 6 months as a constitutional committee under the USSR Supreme Soviet. First of all, all of us who are part of the Supreme Soviet will have a chance to meet them. We will know specifically what kind of people they are, and their work qualities. Moreover, we must use these 6 months to create a law which would regulate the activity of the committee. Thank you for your attention. (Applause).

A.T. Kruglov, assistant flight detachment commander at Syktyvkarskiy Aviation Enterprise, city of Syktyvkar (Syktyvkar territorial electoral district, Komi ASSR): Comrades! I have nothing against the candidacies which have been presented. They are all respectable and worthy people, and I approve of them. However, I would like to point out that the honorable comrades which are numbered in this committee have one, maybe only one, shortcoming. Yet it is a significant one. All of them are over 60, and some even far past 60. (Applause).

Furthermore, during my election campaign which I presented to the voters, my program contained the following point: The renovation of party, economic and state apparatus through the army of capable youth on a competitive basis. During the course of the entire congress, I see no alternative choice and no rejuvenation. Therefore, I support the proposals of the comrades who spoke before me not to hurry with this matter. Especially since we are electing them for a term of 10 years. We should hold the elections on a competitive basis and try to elect younger and more able-bodied people. Thank you for your attention. (Applause).

N.V. Fedorov, senior instructor at Chuvash State University, city of Cheboksary (Moscow national-territorial electoral district, Chuvash ASSR): Honorable people's deputies! We must surely be very responsible to our constituents. It is remarkable that we resolve questions by acquainting ourselves with them on the same day as the question arises. And now once again we are hurrying. Yet the question being resolved is about how constitutional development and legislative development will proceed for at least the next 10 years. Perhaps many of us will not be around then, at least not in this auditorium. Yet the members of the Committee for Constitutional Control will be working and answering to our constituents. Under these conditions, the suggestion made by a number of the people's deputies seems very expedient: Not to hurry in deciding this question which bears such a principle and strategic character, and to be responsible before our constituents.

I am in no way casting doubt upon the candidacy of the well-known Academician Vladimir Nikolayevich Kudryavtsev. Moreover, perhaps not everyone has noticed that Deputy Kudryavtsev in essence has admitted at this congress the unconstitutionality of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium's ukase dated 8 April, referring to the understanding of just such an evaluation by Anatoliy Ivanovich Lukyanov.

The fact is that, actually, the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium's ukase dated 8 April 1989 grossly contradicts Article 119 of the USSR Constitution. And in this respect the candidacy of Deputy Kudryavtsev is very fitting.

Yet perhaps I would not be fulfilling my responsibility to those who elected me if I did not say that after the television broadcast of 10 May ("Legal Channel", I believe) on which Professors Yakovlev and Guliyev spoke, a proposal was presented at the okrug electoral meetings to nominate Professor Vladimir Yevgenyevich Guliyev as an alternative candidate. He was the first to publicly give to the entire country a very well thought-out and qualified political and legal evaluation of the 8 April ukase. They spoke here of the fact that Academician Kudryavtsev also gave such an evaluation at a meeting of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, but we must probably take into consideration the fact that evaluations must, ultimately, be given before all the people.

In support of the proposal made by a number of people's deputies to provide for the possibility of a real choice, I, expressing the interests of my constituents, propose as one of the candidacies (along with the other, very worthy ones)—the candidacy of Professor Vladimir Yevgenyevich Guliyev. I believe that many specialists know him. Thank you.

N.I. Timashova, pensioner, Tatar ASSR, city of Kazan (representing the All-Union Organization of Veterans of War and Labor): Honorable Comrade Chairman, honorable comrade deputies! We have been meeting for quite a long time now. And how many commissions we have already created! I join here the preceding comrades who said that the creation of a Committee for Constitutional Control is as necessary now, in our current situation, as is the air we breathe. That is the first thing.

Secondly, I join in the opinion that all the comrades proposed for membership in the committee are worthy, although many of them we do not know. Yet I have a request from the autonomous republics. One of the main thoughts expressed here was that there are many problems in the autonomous republics, okrugs and oblasts. Therefore, our request is that the membership of the committee include a candidacy from the autonomous republics. This is a large request. (Applause).

I cannot today name the candidacy. Therefore, I propose that we, perhaps, put off the ratification for a day, so that the comrades could once again take a look at their groups of deputies. Alright? But this committee should be ratified at this congress. Thank you.

People's deputy (Did not introduce himself): Comrade Chairman, honorable colleagues! The Estonian delegation of the Estonian deputy corps here comprises 48 people. Among them, unfortunately, there are 2-3 who, first of all, want to present themselves as representatives of all the Russian-speaking residents of the republic—that is one thing. And secondly—they contrapose themselves to the remaining portion of the delegation, the Estonian SSR government, the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet, and the Estonian CP Central Committee. These people represent those forces which would like to, if they could, drive a deeper wedge between the population of the republics, supposedly proceeding from national contradictions. They want to introduce this line toward a schism here and to expand it in such a way as to set the representatives of one republic against another.

Comrades, let us think about what this means. This can lead to the situation whereby the centrifugal tendencies, which are also present, will receive such an additional impetus that later there will be no way that we will be able to "eat this porridge".

As for the Russian-speaking population of Estonia, pardon me, but I represent it in the same measure. If I speak personally for myself, my wife is from Leningrad, my children studied in a Russian school, and half of my constituents are Russians or Russian-speaking. For some reason, some people believe that they have a monopoly on representing the interests of the Russian-speaking population, and they want to make it appear as if others, who were also elected from the entire population (we do not discriminate, people are people), represent only the Estonians. This is not correct. It is a deeply erroneous and, unfortunately, conscious and goal-oriented position.

As for the Committee for Constitutional Control, I am not a jurist. I am a chemist. Therefore, I will express only my own subjective impression. Evidently, the matter

stands as follows: We want to do it in the worst way. Comrades, perhaps we should put it off until the fall? Let us not do something in haste which will later be difficult to correct. Thank you for your attention. (Applause).

Yu.Yu. Voldyrev, senior engineer at the Central Scientific-Research Institute of Shipbuilding Electronics and Technology, Leningrad (Moscow territorial electoral district, Leningrad): We spoke here about the fact that certain comrades are trying to torpedo the elections. I believe that the ones who are torpedoing the election of the Committee for Constitutional Control are those who prepared these elections in this manner. (Applause).

I believe most of you went through an election campaign, and that it lasted more than one month. Today they are telling us to vote within the course of one day for people whom many of us do not know. Here I am in full and complete agreement with the position of the Lithuanian deputies which was expressed somewhat earlier, that this is principally amoral, and that we do not have the right, being responsible to our constituents, to vote for people whom we do not know. This is particularly important when we are electing an organ such as the Committee for Constitutional Control for a term of 10 years.

Why is this happening? Why has such a thing occurred? I believe to a significant degree the reason for this is the fact (and this was mentioned at the party group) that for us the committee is a political instrument. Thus, as long as the Committee for Constitutional Control is for us a political instrument, such things will continue. Moreover, you have probably noticed that today in discussing the question of electing the Committee for Constitutional Control, questions are being posed, essentially, on the mechanism of functioning of authority—those questions which we did not have time to discuss.

I believe that we can in no way elect the Committee for Constitutional Control in such a manner. We cannot elect it until we have seriously discussed the questions of the mechanism of functioning of our authority and the structure of this authority. These are the questions which we have not yet seriously discussed at this congress. Thank you. (Applause).

L.M. Sandulik, head of the biology faculty at Chernovtsy State University (Chernovtsy territorial electoral district, Ukrainian SSR): Most honorable Chairman! Most honorable USSR People's deputies! The USSR Committee for Constitutional Control is a vital state organ, and its election is perhaps the first step toward creating a legal state. I solemnly promised my constituents that if I should have to make crucial state decisions—exercise the authority granted to me by my constituents—I would necessarily study the question, consult with specialists, and ask the opinion of my constituents. It seems to me that today this is just such a case, when we can make a decision only after having studied the opinion of our constituents. I am not speaking of a referendum, but I propose that we put this question off until the next congress, since it is one for which we have not sufficiently prepared, as we received the documents an hour before voting.

In all probability, I will not have the opportunity to speak here again. If we will be ratifying the chairman of the Committee for People's Control, then I say now that I will speak out against the ratification of the candidacy of Comrade Kolbin as a man who took it upon himself to make the decision to "execute or to pardon"—he granted amnesty to people who had violated the law. In doing so, he exhibited lawlessness and still does not understand that he committed an illegal act. Thank you for your attention. (Applause).

Ye.A. Yevtushenko, poet, secretary of the USSR Writer's Union governing board (Kharkovskiy-Dzerzhinskiy territorial electoral district, Ukrainian SSR): Comrades, I was never brought to trial, and never asked for Comrade Kudryavtsev's protection. Moreover, I am not even personally acquainted with him, and our paths have never crossed. However, here is what I would like to say. It seems to me that to the Committee for Constitutional Control we must elect the most immaculate and honest people. This does not mean that I suspect Comrade Kudryavtsev of something dishonest. However, I believe that the proof of professional cleanliness for people of his profession is the behavior of these people at the time when human rights were being violated. I know many people—not professionals in this matter—among our writers and scientists who spoke out in defense of the so-called "dissidents". These, simply speaking, were merely free-thinking people. They defended [these dissidents], got them out of jails and out of mental institutions. I never heard the voice of Comrade Kudryavtsev in this struggle. Yet nevertheless, I would not have spoken up, except that I believe that if we are to vote him in, he must answer my question and tell us what he did to save people from jails, from camps, and from mental institutions.

I would also like to say the following. Recently LITERATURNAYA GAZETA published an article about how a former apprentice of Ryumin, if I am not mistaken his name is Grishayev, excuse me if I make a mistake here, is still teaching law, jurisprudence, etc. Why did I not hear the indignant voice of Comrade Kudryavtsev at this moment?

Yet the main thing that I want to say to you is this. I do not know what Comrade Kudryavtsev said in the lobby of the Politburo, and I do not think that this has any decisive significance for me and for the people in determining whether or not to elect him to this responsible position, just as it is of no importance what I whisper in my wife's ear or what I talk about in the kitchen with my mother-in-law. I heard about how Comrade Kudryavtsev commented on the ukase of 8 April which included the infamous Article 11, which enraged not

only my Kharkov voters, but also all the working people—the working class, the peasantry, and the intelligentsia. Practically under the guise of mild criticism of this ukase there was a hidden advocacy of it and of Article 11, where criticism by a worker—a director or a rank-and-file party member—of a Central Committee Secretary and so forth may be declared a criminally punishable discreditation. Therefore, I would like you to focus attention on these qualities of Comrade Kudryavtsev and on his tendency to such advocacy of rather dubious ukases. I believe that this position should be filled by an impeccable person, and this cleanliness also includes the struggle for which one may lose his head.

And moreover, Mikhail Sergeyevich, I would like to say that we would nevertheless like to have leaders who are a bit younger... I am 56 years old. When I was 30, I fought to become the editor of a journal. Now I will not take this position. Mikhail Sergeyevich, we need people younger than you to lead this committee. This too we must take into consideration. Thank you. (Applause).

People's deputy (did not introduce himself): Honorable comrade Chairman, comrade deputies! Previously, we explained the serious shortcomings in state life by the fact that our system of the Soviet socialist state had no special organ which would implement control over its proper and continuous implementation. Now, when we are creating such a constitutional organ, we hear various voices which explain this way and that, and in general reduce the matter to the fact that we must take our time in creating this committee. We must, they say, wait and see how it will turn out, and so forth. I am in complete disagreement with such a point of view. I believe that specifically at the first congress we must create a Committee for Constitutional Control, and in the make-up which is proposed to us. And as for Comrade Vladimir Nikolayevich Kudryavtsev specifically, the vice-president of the USSR Academy of Sciences, although I am not a jurist and do not know him personally, as a current and, well, enlightened person, if you will not consider this immodest, and as one who keeps abreast of the events in our country, I have known him from afar for at least 15-20 years. And evidently recently, when the question of strengthening the leadership of the USSR Academy of Sciences was being resolved, there was probably good reason to elect him vice-president, who resolves questions associated with the development of the social sciences, including law, in our country. I believe this is one of the most worthy candidates for this important position. I propose that you vote for him, comrade deputies.

Now, as for the representative from our Kazakhstan, we have no doubt about him—about doctor of juridical sciences, Professor Gayrate Sapargaliyev. He is a well-trained and qualified man, who will successfully handle this assignment and will be worthy of representing the interests of our Kazakh Soviet Socialist Republic. Thank you. (Applause).

M.S. Gorbachev: We should probably bring this discussion to a close. We will have just a few more speakers.

V.I. Alksnis, lieutenant-colonel, senior engineer-inspector of a military unit, Baltic Military District (Yuglskiy national-territorial electoral district, Latvian SSR): Many representatives from the Baltic have already spoken from this rostrum. They spoke very loud words about returning to the Leninist principles of federalism. However, I would like to specify that, while their words speak for federalism, they are in fact proposing confederation.

I would like to address the Supreme Soviet Presidium with the request that the jurists give us, the deputies, a report on the basic indicators of confederation and federation so that the deputies could clearly distinguish when they are trying to push through the ideas of confederation veiled in pretty words. Moreover, I would like to bring to your attention the following information. On 31 May of this year, during the work of our congress, the Duma of the Latvian People's Front appealed to all the People's Front members. Up until now, the Latvian People's Front, in all of its activities, based on the principles adopted at the constituent congress and on its program, emphasized the first alternative—the principle of federation. However, the events of recent months testify to the fact that the efforts of all of the Baltic and Latvia in achieving this goal are encountering ever-increasing political, economic, and ideological counteraction from the center and the internal reactionary forces, up to the application of open violence, as was evidenced by the tragic events of 9 April in Tbilisi.

The course of the USSR Congress of People's Deputies testifies to the fact that the conservative majority which has been formed here speaks out against the union republic aspirations aimed at full state sovereignty. In connection with this, the Latvian People's Front duma governing board presents a question which is vitally important to our people for discussion in all the groups and sections of the Latvian People's Front. This is the question of beginning the struggle of the Latvian People's Front for full political and economic independence of Latvia. That is, for the first time the mask has been cast aside and the primary goal of the Latvian People's Front has been defined—this is the struggle for secession from the USSR. On 16 June we will hold a session of the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet. Thus, the following task is presented in this appeal—to see that the 16 June session of the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet adopts a declaration on the state sovereignty of Latvia, the amendments to the Constitution of the Latvian SSR regarding the right of ownership of the Latvian SSR, and ratification of USSR laws, so that the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet immediately adopts the law on economic independence of Latvia. Latvia is today the only one of the Baltic republics which has no such amendments to its constitution. Yet the Latvian People's Front is now forcing the adoption of such a legal draft upon the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet.

In the name of my constituents, who specified one of my main tasks as fighting for strengthening our Soviet Federation, I spoke out against these aspirations, and I appeal to you: Comrades, it is true that in the Baltic republics, by means of adoption of discriminatory laws which belittle human dignity, a system of national oppression is indeed being formed. From this high tribunal I turn to the representatives, including also to international organizations on human rights, with a request to come to the Baltic republics and evaluate the correspondence of these laws to the standards of international law. (Applause).

I also speak out for the need to create a USSR Committee for Constitutional Control which could verify the implementation of the Constitution and other USSR laws on the territory of the Baltic. (Applause).

R.A. Bratun, writer (Lvov-Zaliznichnyy territorial electoral district, Ukrainian SSR): I, by the way, acquainted myself with the materials which our Baltic comrades presented to us, and I saw there no desire to secede from the Soviet Union. The struggle for their sovereignty and for republic cost accounting is not a struggle against Soviet authority. (Applause).

I am surprised by the speeches of Comrade Kogan and our countryman who spoke yesterday, I believe, and talked about the existence of storm trooper detachments. If this is so, then it is really shocking. But are these not simply worker's detachments, which are tagged with the label of storm detachments? (Noise in the auditorium.) I know that, for example, many workers collectives have delegated their representatives to worker detachments. I think our comrades from the Baltic should explain this to us. If this is so, this is really scandalous, and we must condemn this. But perhaps this is not so. I somehow doubt your interpretation. I personally believe that the question of constitutional control is a very important question. It is the first big step by our Union toward a legal state. Therefore, we should not make hasty decisions here today. We must consult with our constituents who have sent us here and who have instructed us to fight for a legal state and for such an organ of it as constitutional control. It is very important. I think that if we wait until the fall, nothing terrible will happen. (Applause).

I.N. Gryazin, section head at the Estonian SSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Philosophy, Sociology and Law, Tartu (Pyarnuskiy rural national-territorial electoral district, Estonian SSR): It is very difficult for me to keep from answering, but I would like to respond to certain of the colleague-deputies, including Kogan, for example. Yet I will not do so, because, whether we want to or not, this discussion must lead to some kind of compromise. If I were to respond, then I would continue to fan that argument which has already arisen. Yet we must come to some kind of result. Is that not so?

As far as I understand, two positions have become delineated. The first position is to reject the election of a Committee for Constitutional Control in general. The second position is not only to elect the committee, but to tell it how it must punish poor Estonia. These are two extremes. There is also a central position. For the sake of fairness I must say that I am inclined toward the first position. But that is not the question. I am not defending this position. Here we need a compromise.

I realistically envision such a compromise now. The status of the formed committee really does evoke some doubts in a juridical plane, particularly coordination of its status with certain other articles of the Constitution, including the principle of sovereignty of the union republic.

Therefore, I support the idea which was repeatedly expressed here, and specifically: Since the question is serious, dear deputies, it is oh-so serious!—let us not be hasty. The second congress is not far away. Let us examine this complex question with the constitutional status of the committee itself. Thank you. Let us live as friends!

I.V. Sorokin, senior officer in charge of criminal investigation operations, internal affairs section, Kuybyshev station, Kuybyshev (Lenin territorial electoral district, Kuybyshev Oblast, RSFSR): I am in favor of creating a Committee for Constitutional Control. Yet there is one thing—none of us know those candidates which are presented in this list. That is one thing. Secondly, we must think through, I believe, the mechanism of competitive selection.

And finally, we plan and implement these committee elections. I would like to propose the candidacy of Comrade Sobachak from Leningrad for membership in the committee. Thank you.

M.S. Gorbachev: Just a second. Let us allow the two comrades who are here to speak. With this we will conclude the discussion and will summarize. Alright?

A.Ya. Tsirulis, editor-in-chief of the newspaper PADOMYU YAUNATNE, Riga (Bauskiy national-territorial electoral district, Latvian SSR): I understand your indignation. When you listen to our "Interfront" representatives, what they say really does appear awful. I would truly be an unhappy man if this were really so. Yet even on the day of registration, speaking on Central Television, I suggested that it organize a direct broadcast from the Baltic republics on which questions could be answered. There are also other ways. Yet it is very difficult to judge about Latvcia, Lithuania and Estonia, as we have heard here at the congress, as well as about the life of the other republics, only from the pages of the central newspapers and from the broadcasts of Central radio and television. After all, a very broad spectrum of opinions must be presented here.

I liked very much the proposal by Comrade Alksnis, who spoke of inviting international representatives for verification. They are very much needed in Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia, and this would bring much benefit. We are very much in need of glasnost. And we would be very grateful for this. (Applause).

R.A. Medvedev, historian, writer, Moscow (Voroshilovskiy territorial electoral district, Moscow, RSFSR): I would like, comrades, in the discussion of such a delicate question, to refer to the authority of Vladimir Ilyich Lenin and to read only three short excerpts in connection with that confrontation which has arisen here between the majority of the delegations and the delegations from the Baltic republics.

Lenin wrote: "...We must distinguish... the nationalism of a large nation from the nationalism of a small nation."

"In regard to the second form nationalism, almost always in historical practice we, the nationals of a large nation, are guilty of an endless number of coersions, and even more than that. We unwittingly perform an endless number of coersions and insults—we have only to recall them...". I will list the facts later.

"Therefore," wrote Lenin, "internationalism on the part of the oppressor or so-called 'great' nation (although it is great only in its coercion...) must consist not only of maintaining the formal equality of nations, but also of such inequality which would compensate on the part of the ... large nation... that inequality which in fact arises in life. Whoever has not understood this has not understood the truly proletarian attitude toward the national question. He has remained, in essence, at the viewpoint of the petty bourgeois and therefore cannot help but descend each minute to the bourgeois point of view."

This is why for Lenin in this case, in examining the relations between a large and a small nation, "...it is better to overdo in the direction of concessions and softness toward the national minorities than not to give enough attention to them. This is why in this case the basic interest of proletarian solidarity, and consequently also the proletarian class struggle, demands that we never have a formal attitude toward the national question, but always consider the necessary difference in the attitude of the proletariat of a small nation... and a large one... Lenin. Written 3 December." (Applause). Therefore, I propose: Since here the opinion of the majority of the Baltic delegation and the delegations of the Baltic republics to put this question off until the next session has become apparent, we will not be doing anything criminal if we examine this extremely important problem and select a constitutional commission for a term of 10 years at the fall session of the USSR Congress of People's Deputies. (Applause).

M.S. Gorbachev: I do not take upon myself the entire burden of responsibility for this decision. Let us seek it together. I believe.. Ah yes, excuse me, Comrade Kudryavtsev wanted to speak. Please.

V.N. Kudryavtsev, vice president of the USSR Academy of Sciences, Moscow (representing the CPSU): Dear comrades, I would like to answer those questions which you have presented to me and also to say a few words about how I understand this difficult work. You see, the work, if you speak about me and the Committee, is in general extremely difficult, as is already evident from the debates. But first I would like to speak on specific questions. First of all, Comrade Balayan, who read a quote here from a political-legal commentary on the name of the autonomous oblast. He is right. We must say that, of course, it was not written correctly there, unfortunately. I do not remember this text, but he probably quoted it correctly, that the autonomous oblast is supposedly named after the name of the people who live there. You see for yourselves that this is not quite so, and does not always correspond to reality. Therefore, we must admit that it is a mistake. (Applause).

I will not say who the author of this text was. There is no need to applaud, because I am not the author of this section. I simply do not know who the author there was. Yet I was a member of the editorial staff, and of course, I should have noticed this.

Secondly, regarding Yevgeniy Aleksandrovich Yevtushenko. Since he had such a serious reproach addressed to me, I would like to deal, Yevgeniy Aleksandrovich, with some of your comments.

Regarding saving [people] from prisons. Here is what I must say... Different people act differently in such cases, utilizing their different capacities. One person does this by means of speaking out at meetings and making appeals for freeing someone, while someone else does so in the form of letters to a newspaper or some other presentations. And if this concerns a jurist, especially the director of the State and Law Institute, naturally he has certain other channels for this purpose. I cannot recount them all now. Aleksandr Maksimovich Yakovlev, who spoke here, and I once counted during his election campaign how many people he had freed. We cannot say exactly, but in any case he aided in liberating many people from jails, because he is approached by about 5-6 people a month on this question. Overall, around 20 people a month turn to the institute, and for the most part we help them, because about 50 percent of these appeals, unfortunately, are rightful. Unfortunately in the sense that, it seems to us, many people are being imprisoned illegally and unfairly. In these cases we always take measures to restore justice by those means which are accessible to us. We do not write to newspapers or turn to the Procurator General, to the USSR Supreme Court or the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium if it is a question of amnesty, or use other similar channels. That is one side of the question. The other side of the question also deals

with the work of the institute. And of the director, obviously. This work is the preparation of legislation which proceeds along the line of humanization. Yevgeniy Aleksandrovich, I cannot see where you are sitting. There—at the end? It is better to talk to a person when you can see him.

I will tell you now about legislation, including that concerning political prisoners. After all, you are not a professional, Yevgeniy Aleksandrovich. One must know certain details here. You, perhaps, do not know that a year ago a resolution was adopted concerning the mental institutions. The document is a rather serious one. Although I think that it has not been 100 percent perfected. We fought to see that it be brought 100 percent to the end, up to world standards. In any case, that which was done there was, of course, a great step forward. After all, you do not know of the participation here of either myself or my associates. Why should I advertise myself here?

I can also tell you about one other document, where I headed up the commission. This was the draft of the Principles of Criminal Legislation for the USSR and the union republics, which was published in the press. This draft is currently being subjected to criticism for humanism, which you prehaps know, because this has been rather broadly illuminated in the press.

Now I must mention the ukase of 8 April. Here, I might add, is a note which I just received. It says: "At the request of my constituents, I ask that you tell us whether Deputy Kudryavtsev was one of the authors of the 8 April ukase on criminal responsibility for state crimes, Article 11." First of all, I will say directly that I am not the author, and secondly I would like to explain the situation a bit so that it is clear to all the deputies.

The ukase of 8 April is a fragment or, I would say, an element of another document—the draft of the Law on State Crimes. Such a draft had been prepared for about 6 months or 2 years. Many jurists participated in its preparation, including some from our institute. I can assure you (I just do not have the text with me now) that this draft was quite democratic, and its main purpose was to replace the former Law on State Crimes, which was based on former Stalinist legislation. That was its main purpose. And this group, I believe, achieved its goals. I speak of the draft which existed prior to the 8 April ukase. This can all be confirmed. There are no state secrets here.

When the ukase came out, it was just as unexpected for me as, I think, for all those present here. Anatoliy Ivanovich Lukyanov already spoke about this ukase when he was asked questions. I spoke out with the first commentary, about which Yevgeniy Aleksandrovich Yevtushenko spoke here. Only he is wrong when he affirms what I supposedly said there about Article 11. I did not say that. This too is not hard to verify. Seeing the shortcomings of Article 11, I did not mention it in my commentary. Perhaps this was wrong on my part, to keep quiet about it. But on that very same day I mentioned this to several leading officials. And then, as mentioned here by Aleksandr Maksimovich Yakovlev, at the meeting of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo I also openly spoke about this—about the shortcomings of this article. Judge for yourselves whether I did right or wrong... After all, the congress judges. I do not have to judge. I only want to say that discussions in the Politburo are not discussions "with my mother-in-law in the kitchen." (Applause).

One other comment of yours, Yevgeniy Aleksandrovich, I fully accept. That is about my age. It is a bad age. I am old already, born in 1923. There is nothing I can do about it. I personally believed that it is much better to be young within the membership of this committee. But if this trust is given to me, and as long as I am alive, then that means I must work. That is how I understand this matter. (Applause).

Now, Mikhail Sergeyevich, excuse me, perhaps I am dragging this out too long, but I would like to say a few words of a more general nature. I also believe that this is a necessary institution. This, strictly speaking, is an element of a legal state and a continuation of the line toward separation of powers and, if you will, toward the creation of those "checks and balances" which we as yet do not have in our political mechanism. Of course it will not simply work and will not simply counteract various forces, which even today are being manifested in this auditorium. Yet the committee has certain capacities, specifically independence. As you remember, according to the USSR Constitution the committee is subordinate only to the congress. It is not subordinate even to the USSR Supreme Soviet. The only organ to which the committee is responsible is the congress. And I believe that the committee must, of course, adopt the line toward legality, toward democratization, toward the preservation of rights of citizens and toward the struggle against departmental lawmaking.

There is one difficult question. It was raised by the deputies from the Baltic. And of course, it should not be circumvented. The difficulty lies in the fact that our Constitution is old, while the legislation will be renewed. Honorable comrade deputy from the Baltic, you could have presented another example. Well, let us say, for example, a law on leasing is issued, while the Constitution contains nothing on lease agreements. Does this mean that the Committee for Constitutional Control must, consequently, put an end to the law on leasing and find it anti-constitutional? This is not a simple question, perhaps because we must be prudent here in our practical application. As concerns, let us say, republic legislation, I believe that we must change over to the new federalism and restore the Leninist principles of federal relations between the Union and the republics. My point of view is that in this difficult situation, in connection with the republic and Union Constitutions, we may fully

find prudent juridical decisions which are not as unattainable as some believe. We may find a normal solution to this question which would satisfy, I believe, both the Union and the republics.

And finally. I must say here that after all, the committee is a collective organ. It is not the chairman who decides something there. He cannot decide anything by himself. It is 23 people. I might add that I believe the committee should work openly and rest on the will of the congress, on its resolutions and those laws which it will adopt. And, of course, we must create a law on constitutional control, which we do not have at the present time. Obviously, the congress should assign this matter to one or another membership of the committee and to the Supreme Soviet. I believe that the matter here is not one of position, but of that responsible work which muist be performed within one membership group or another, because this organ is a step forward on the road to a legal and democratic state. Thank you! (Applause).

M.S. Gorbachev: We agreed to stop the exchange of opinions with this. Is that right?

Voices from the audience: Yes, it is.

M.S. Gorbachev: Allow me to summarize the discussion of this question. In general, comrades, it seems to me that there is no reason for us to be suspicious of one another, both of the deputies and the republics. I would like to remove this [suspicion] right now. After all, in general we have never had a Committee for Constitutional Control, and we survived. The USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium previously implemented control over adherence to the USSR Constitution and ensured the correspondence of the constitutions and laws of the union republics to the Constitution and laws of the USSR, and it continues to do so now, after the amendment to the USSR Constitution. That is how it was prior to the amendment in November. That is how it is now, after the amendment in November. Thus, we may remove entirely the question of the Committee for Constitutional Control. Yet let us recall why this question arose. Because it was hoped that through this mechanism—this very serious, constitutional mechanism created by the congress itself and subordinate only to it—we might create such an instrument which would strengthen the Constitution and aid in strengthening the line toward implementation of laws and legal principles, and so that this committee, this instrument, might act in such a way that no one, under the guise of implementation and development of a certain law, could render it lifeless at the stage of its realization. Yet you and I already have this experience, and comments to this effect have resounded at the congress. There is a law on State Enterprise and there are decisions (the comrades even gave an example, I do not know how accurate it is, that even the government somewhere undermined a law, despite the fact that it authored the draft of this law which was introduced for discussion). The departments have created many instructions for interpreting the application of a law, by which they have even more greatly limited the essence of the law and "bridled" it.

Thus, the existence of such a juridical organ is a very important instrument enabling us to stand strictly in defense of laws. This is very necessary, because the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, despite all its capacities and all of its authority, simply does not always encompass the entire set of problems for the purpose of working out these questions in detail. Therefore, the debates were extensive. The question of the Committee for Constitutional Control was raised. There was a discussion about the constitutional court, what form to establish in order to strengthen specifically this part of our legal mechanism, which would stand firm in guarding the Constitution and the laws. Therefore, it seems to me that we are going toward the creation of a Committee for Constitutional Control. This merely strengthens the capacities of our entire federation—all our citizens and labor collectives, republics and autonomous formations, etc—to clarify through this mechanism our concerns, to use it as a competent organ. I might add that this would be an independent organ compiled in this way, democratically, whose purpose would be to achieve a correct sequence in the realization of constitutional principles.

I believe, comrades, that to argue over this question, and moreover to refute or cast doubt upon the need for creating a Committee for Constitutional Control, is to cut the branch on which we are all sitting. Therefore, dear friends from the Baltic, let us get down to the essence of the matter. Perhaps we will not create a committee at all. Let us decide together. I told about how we came to the necessity of its creation. Yet as long as we have the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, it will control everything. Nevertheless, the best forces of our jurisprudence are concentrated in the Committee for Constitutional Control. We are taking here the most mature jurists, authoritative people who will help the republics as well as the citizens, the collectives and the central organs to solve this very important problem. This corresponds to our line for the creation of a socialist legal state.

Now, as for your concerns, and including also the formulas which certain deputies have proposed here. How should we act on this? I have here the signatures of Comrades Gorbunov, Bisher, Bresis and others. And this has resounded here in proposals.

I believe, comrades, that naturally we are faced with the need of having a new USSR Constitution. The outline of the resolution which you have received, the main decision on the discussion of the questions of foreign and domestic policy, provides for the creation of a Constitutional Commission. It will begin work. Then we will be able to address it.

Secondly, even before the Constitutional Commission prepares a project and submits it for discussion by the congress, and later, evidently, the congress (if it sees fit) will submit it for referendum or public discussion (we will decide this), we must travel a certain path. Yet, evidently, the need for moving along the path of political and economic reform, along the path of restructuring, will present us with questions which we must resolve through the preparation and introduction of amendments to the Constitution. These are the proposals which are being born. Based on the fact that we are proceeding along the road of restructuring, we will have to catch all the needs for changes in the entire system of our institutions created today, so that outdated laws (I am speaking in this case not only about the Constitution) do not stand in our way.

The law always lags behind. This is an old rule. It is natural. Yet at the same time I believe that we cannot formulate the matter in such a way that we have some kind of bacchanalia in regard to our own Constitution. Whatever it may be. If proposals arise which are necessary for restructuring to be realized and to move ahead, that means that amendments and changes are needed in the Constitution. Having prepared certain proposals, we formulate them and introduce them in an established order. For this we now have mechanisms which will help us to quickly and competently develop and introduce the question of amendments to the Constitution.

In other words, I would reason with you as follows. First of all, it is no accident that we have come to the point where we need such a very important organ. Secondly, I believe that we, embarking upon the path of implementing restructuring and engaging for this purpose all the mechanisms—the Supreme Soviet, the Committee for Constitutional Control, and the Constitutional Commission—will find a way to catch the questions which are coming to a head and find for them the correct solutions.

I believe, comrades, if we adhere to the cause of revitalizing and strengthening our federation on Leninist principles and proceed on this path, then we will find all the answers and resolve all the questions. Therefore, on this part I would agree with the comrades: Let us not now pose one or another question to each other, so that this would appear as a dictate, as an ultimatum. Yet by the essence of the questions, we will have to one way or another compare any proposals, whoever they emanate from. That is as it should be. That is a normal legal process. Does this correspond do the current laws or not? If it does not correspond, then we must improve [these laws], since we consider correct and justified the proposals which are associated with our progress along the road of reform.

Therefore, I would think that the creation of a Committee for Constitutional Control would give us just this opportunity to better resolve the questions which are coming to a head. And this should not, I believe, in any sense foster any doubts in anyone's mind as to the possibility that something can stand in the way of reform.

Yet now two proposals remain. To create the committee now or in the fall? (Animation in the auditorium).

From the audience: (Inaudible).

M.S. Gorbachev: They ask, why are we electing the committee members for 10 years, while deputies are elected for only 5 years? This, comrades, is the generally accepted practice, in order to give stability to their work. As a rule, I might add—as was mentioned at the Supreme Soviet yesterday—in the whole world they try to select the wisest and most competent people for this institution and for the Supreme court.

I might add that everyone who becomes a member of the Committee for Constitutional Control must give up his deputy duties. They should not be deputies. This too is a clear question.

Thus, we have to decide all this. I considered it possible to introduce this proposal, comrades. I ask for your attention. I understand—the question is a heated one, and evokes discussion. Yet we can work in such an auditorium only when there is a certain order. Otherwise this would be the Novgorod vetche [popular assembly in ancient Russia].

I believe and am convinced that we acted correctly in introducing the proposal to decide this question today. Why? I will tell you. After all, nothing is done well if its pros and cons are not first considered and thought out. The question of the make-up of this organ was worked out already in preliminary order (this was assigned to the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium) over the period of the last 3 months, and the proposals from the republics were formulated as a result of discussion. These were the proposals of the republics themselves, and if from 21 people we subtract the representatives of the republics, then a small part remains—6 people, about whom we are speaking. These are: the chairman, his deputy, and certain representatives of the center. In essence, this is a well thought out, well developed question, and absolutely no mistrust emerged toward the opinion of the republics. And, in my opinion, no one raised such a question. It arose in regard to Belorussia, but Comrade Tarazevich, speaking in the name of Belorussia, removed this question, as I understand. Therefore, you know, it seems to me that we can decide this question, considering all the comments and argumentation of all the comrades. Only here is what I want to say, comrades. Am I getting the mistaken impression that someone has a certain understanding that some of us are supposedly in a hurry to conclude this congress? I believe we worked normally and this was not the case. Yet I am beginning to

question whether there is a desire here to drag out the congress under any pretext. To impose, so to speak, these particular discussions. Especially since the circle of orators is the same.

M.S. Gorbachev: So, comrades, let us do this. Let no one suspect that we want to conclude the congress in haste. We can even call a recess in its work, if that is what the congress decides. And come back again in a few days... Yet it seems to me that yesterday on the basis of a collective exchange of opinions we were able to come to the conclusion that we have already solved the primary tasks which we presented for the first congress. Yet we cannot solve all the problems. It seems, we must be realists. This first congress has thrown out so many opinions, so many proposals, that we still have to digest all that was said. It is good that we have come to an agreement that in the fall—this means soon—there will be another congress, etc. Let us not be suspicious of one another and back each other into a corner. Let us nevertheless together—as the comrade from Estonia, I believe, just said—let us work together as friends, I am for that. I am in favor of that! So that no one will feel himself to be the victor or the vanquished at this congress. It is our democracy that wins. The process of political reform wins. Through this congress and through the struggle of opinions we are entering a difficult—perhaps we are not happy with everything—but already a new stage of development of democracy, glasnost, and the political process in the country in general. I apologize for discoursing before you, but you must know my opinion, and now you have the right to decide for yourselves.

So, there is the first proposal—to decide the question of the committee. And the second proposal—to put it off. A compromise.

Voices from the audience: Let us vote. Why worry needlessly?

M. S. Gorbachev: Yes.

People's deputy (Does not introduce himself): Well, here is what I want to say. I have a proposal to elect this committee now, but as a committee to prepare its status—after all, it does not yet exist. We will verify them in deed, and in the fall, perhaps, we will also ratify them in the form of this committee. (Noise, applause).

M.S. Gorbachev: Let us conclude, comrades.

V.N. Korneyenko, digital program machine tool adjuster, Gomel Radio Plant, Gomel (Gomel city national-territorial electoral district, Belorussian SSR): Deputy Tarazevich spoke here in the name of the Belorussian delegation. In connection with this, I would like to make the following announcement. The Belorussian delegation has not discussed the candidacy of Comrade Yemenov. Therefore, I believe, he does not have the right to pose the question this way. That is all I have to say.

M.S. Gorbachev: Let us first decide how we will build the bridge—in length or in breadth—and then the personal questions will come later. Thus, comrades, the first proposal—to formulate the Committee for Constitutional Control now. Who is in favor of proceeding with this, I ask you to raise your cards.

Now we must decide in principle: Will we formulate the committee or not? And then all the rest. I ask you to raise your cards. Please lower them. Opposed? Comrades, there is no need to count here: It is a clear minority.

Voices from the audience: (Inaudible).

M.S. Gorbachev: You do not understand what we are voting on? I thought I had formulated it clearly. I repeat. We must now decide the question of whether to begin work on formulating the committee or to put it off until the fall. The first proposal is to formulate it now. Who is in favor of doing this now...

Voices from the audience: (Inaudible).

M.S. Gorbachev: The comrade is in favor of the proposal, but with different powers.

Thus, the first proposal is to formulate now, to begin formulating the membership of the Committee for Constitutional Control.

Everyone in favor of this proposal, please raise your cards. Please lower them.

Everyone opposed? Comrades, do we need a count? No?

Voices from the audience: Yes, we do.

M. S. Gorbachev: We do. Count the votes.

A. G. Kostenyuk: Honorable deputies! 33 deputies have voted against the proposal.

M.S. Gorbachev: Who has abstained?

A.G. Kostenyuk: There were 61 deputies who abstained from the vote.

M.S. Gorbachev: Thus, the decision has been adopted.

A.G. Kostenyuk: The deputies from the Lithuanian republic did not participate in the voting. Fifty deputies.

M.S. Gorbachev: Out of?...

A.G. Kostenyuk: Comrades! Tell us how many are present altogether in the Lithuanian delegation. 58?

Voices from the audience: No....

A.G. Kostenyuk: Then, I am sorry. Please raise your hands so that we can count how many are present.

Voices from the audience: (Inaudibie).

M.S. Gorbachev: I simply say that we were deciding the processual question...

Comrades, I ask that you remain calm, because all of this is not so simple. We must not simplify it, and I would not simplify it in this case... It is all quite difficult. We must consult now on what to do further.

How will we act further, comrades?

People's deputy (did not introduce himself): Dear comrade deputies! Nevertheless, one of the important questions is the creation of a committee which does not have its own status. We cannot, we do not have the right to create a committee until a statute has been developed. A compromise decision has been expressed here, and now it is becoming particularly important to not create the Committee for Constitutional Control today... To create a commission (applause), to create a commission for working out the status of this committee. Perhaps in the same make-up, but a commission nevertheless. And based on how it will work, we will see whether it can be transformed into the Committee for Constitutional Control. That is my proposal. (Applause).

F. M. Burlatskiy, political observer for LITERATURNAYA GAZETA, Moscow (representing the Soviet Peace Fund in conjunction with eight Soviet committees speaking out for peace, solidarity, and international cooperation): Comrades! We must approach the moment we are living with all responsibility. Because we have convened this congress, our leaders have convened this congress in the name of democracy, in the name of developing restructuring, and in the name of unity. And we must seek means of achieving such unity. I propose that we put off the discussion of this question until tomorrow, and ask the congress Presidium and Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev personally to enter into negotiations with the representatives of the Lithuanian delegations and to report on this question tomorrow here at the congress. Thank you. (Applause).

T.V. Moshnyaga, chief physician of the republic clinical hospital, Kishinev (Kishinev-Lenin national-territorial electoral district, Moldavian SSR): Honorable comrade deputies! From the standpoint of our delegation, the committee for Constitutional Control is a most important organ for the Congress of People's Deputies, since it will implement control over the adherence to the Constitution—the Basic Law of the country. And the Basic Law of the country provides for not infringing upon the interests of any other republic, not infringing upon the interests of any other Constitution. Consequently, this constitutional control will at the same time examine also questions of adherence to the constitutions of the union republics. Therefore, since there are differences of opinion on creating such a committee, on voting both on the principle and on the membership, I propose that we put off the examination of this question, at least until, as was proposed now, we can consult on it one more time. Thank you.

M.S. Gorbachev: Perhaps we should not develop the discussion now?

Voices from the audience: No.

M.S. Gorbachev: I would suggest Comrade Burlatskiy's proposal...

Voices from the audience: That is right.

M.S. Gorbachev: Nevertheless, comrades we, perhaps, have developed definite emotions and definite attitudes. There were probably many such emotions, and they will emerge many more times among us—that is not the worst thing. The worst thing is if our congress does not find such solutions which would correspond to the spirit of restructuring, the politics of restructuring, and the harmonization of interethnic relations, with consideration of the fact that we must also harmonize all points of view.

It seems to be the most simple question—to decide right away. Yet I think that the wisest decision would nevertheless be to accept Comrade Burlatskiy's proposal and to have the Presidium consult with the deputies from Lithuania and report on the results tomorrow. Alright? Yes, comrades?

Voices from the audience: Yes.

M.S. Gorbachev: Do we need a vote?

Voices from the audience: No.

M.S. Gorbachev: Good. And with those deputies who have left...

Voices from the audience: (Inaudible).

M.S. Gorbachev: Please.

Yu.Yu. Bredikis, chief of the 1st chair of surgery, Kaunas Medical Institute; head of the All-Union Center for Surgical Treatment of Serious Disruptions in Cardiac Rhythm, Lithuanian SSR, Kaunas (Representing the All-Union "Znaniye" Society): As we were coming to the congress, we of course understood that during voting there may always be a majority of votes, and our opinion, even though we may stubbornly defend it, may not always be heard. That is what has happened now.

Yet I agree that we should continue the discussion some more. Of course, the opinion that we should put off the question would be, in my mind, the most logical. But now I have a question. Are those results neutralized which were just voted on, until tomorrow?

M.S. Gorbachev: I think for now the question of the results of voting is not removed. We will hold the talks... And, naturally, with the deputies from Latvia.

From the audience: (Inaudible).

M.S. Gorbachev: Are you speaking on this question? Well, comrades, in general we have decided. Do we need to continue the discussion? Comrades, let us consider this question resolved. That is all. You and I must all adhere to the decision that has been adopted. Let us not suspect that some are Leninists, and others are not. Otherwise, we could, you know, go too far....

We still have many questions [to discuss]. Let us recess until 1900, and then work some more. We will recess until 1900.

(Recess).

Gorbachev: Esteemed comrades! Let us continue work. We have agreed as follows: After today's sitting we shall meet with comrades from the Lithuanian delegation and talk with them. A proposal is already taking shape here which we shall possibly submit tomorrow after more detailed discussion.

But now—back to the agenda. On the chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet. The USSR Supreme Soviet has elected Comrade Yevgeniy Aleksandrovich Smolentsev. Comrade Smolentsev is an experienced man who has worked for several years on the USSR Supreme Court. Recently he has been working as chairman of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Supreme Court. Is Comrade Smolentsev here?

From the floor: Yes.

M.S Gorbachev: Comrade Smolentsev, come on up. What thoughts or questions are there for him? We listened for an hour in the Supreme Soviet yesterday to his answers to quite a lot of questions. But nevertheless, I want to present Comrade Smolentsev to you. I repeat: If there are no questions, may we proceed to the vote.... No?

From the floor: One question.

M.S. Gorbachev: Please, go ahead. Put your question, Comrade Aparin. Switch on microphone 2.

I.V. Aparin, first secretary of Kytmanovskiy CPSU Rayon Committee raykom, Kytmanovo settlement (Novoaltayskiy Territorial Electoral Okrug, Altay Kray): Yevgeniy Alekseyevich, for 10 years you were deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Court. Many questions are arising now in connection with the so-called Gdlyan case and charges are being leveled at that group of investigators. But do we really not have here a court of ultimate jurisdiction which examines all such cases and draws the final conclusion: that either the charge is right or the accused is? Are you and the Supreme Court together not involved in what has happened and the stage that we have now reached in connection with the Gdlyan case? Should the investigators alone bear the responsibility for this? Thank you.

Ye.A. Smolentsev, chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Court: I do not quite understand the question. I believe that deputies have created a very authoritative commission here which is to investigate these questions in the broad sense. That is, not just the conduct of the investigators engaged in the investigation of well-known cases and those cases of bribery which are now being tried. I do not think that this is the right time for perhaps the future chairman of the USSR Supreme Court and the present chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Court to make any comment because it is not impossible that I shall have to examine some of these cases.

I.V. Aparin: Excuse me, you have probably not quite understood me: I would like the opinion not of the present chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Court but of the deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Court in which capacity you worked for 10 years. Is that right?

Ye.A. Smolentsev: Yes.

I.V. Aparin: Well then: All these cases—the Khint case and others in connection with which the Gdlyan group is now being accused of a breach of procedure—have been examined at the Supreme Court. Were there no appeals about violations having occurred in the process? After all, ultimately Supreme Courts passed sentence. My question is: Do they not bear responsibility for the violations which occurred?

Ye.A. Smolentsev: The Supreme Court of the union has examined a whole series of cases involving responsible workers from Uzbekistan. Sentences have been passed in those cases which have been examined. In some cases partial decisions were made on the violations which occurred. As for the so-called Churbanov case, all the violations were committed, so to speak, in the sentence itself. And in connection with that one of the accused was acquitted while the case of a second was directed for further investigation. I was not directly involved in the examination of those cases, I was working at the RSFSR Supreme Court at that time, and it is simply difficult for me to comment on them now.

M.S. Gorbachev: Good. Can I put the question of confirmation to the vote? Those in favor of the confirmation of Comrade Smolentsev as chairman of the USSR Supreme Court, please raise your mandate cards. Lower them, please. Those against? (The votes are counted). Hands down please.

A.G. Kostenyuk: Esteemed deputies, 14 deputies voted against.

M.S. Gorbachev: Who abstained? (Votes are counted).

A.G. Kostenyuk: There are 77 abstentions.

M.S. Gorbachev: The question is settled. Comrade Smolentsev has been confirmed as chairman of the USSR Supreme Court. (Applause).

On the USSR chief state arbiter. The USSR Supreme Soviet has appointed Comrade Yuriy Gennadiyevich Matveyev to this post. There was quite a broad exchange of opinions on the discussion of this question, too. Is Comrade Matveyev here? Come up here and introduce yourself to the congress, please.

I present Comrade Yuriy Gennadiyevich Matveyev to you. Deputies may ask him questions if they want. Do I have your support?

From the hall: Yes.

M.S. Gorbachev: Good. Thank you. Those in favor of the confirmation of Comrade Yuriy Gennadiyevich Matveyev as USSR chief state arbiter, please raise your cards. Lower them. Those against? (Votes are counted).

A.G. Kostenyuk: Esteemed deputies, there are 6 votes against.

M.S. Gorbachev: Abstentions? (Votes are counted).

A.G. Kostenyuk: There are 28 abstentions.

M.S. Gorbachev: In that case, Comrade Matveyev has been confirmed as USSR chief state arbiter. (Applause).

Comrades! The USSR Supreme Soviet has elected Gennadiy Vasilyevich Kolbin chairman of the USSR People's Control Committee. If any of the deputies are unfamiliar with the discussion held at the USSR Supreme Soviet sitting, I would say that the discussion was most extensive and principled. Nevertheless, this is the result.

Comrade Kolbin is sure to be somewhere in the hall. Gennadiy Vasilyevich, please.

I know that you are familiar with Comrade Kolbin but even so I am going to present him to you and invite you to ask him questions if there is anything that needs clarification.

G.V. Kolbin, first secretary of the Kazakh Communist Party Central Committee, Alma-Ata city (Prikaspiyskiy Territorial Electoral Okrug, Guryev Oblast): Mikhail Sergeyevich, I would like to answer a rejoinder expressed during the first half of the evening sitting. Namely, that I am high-handed. I have never been high-handed wherever I have worked and I have not interfered in court proceedings or investigations. As for recovering money in Kazakhstan related to the misrepresentation of statistics, all that was done according to strict legal procedure and by decision of the court. (Applause).

M.S. Gorbachev: I must confirm that yesterday generally speaking such clarity was lacking. And therefore comrades correctly said to you....

G.V. Kolbin: Mikhail Sergeyevich, I would like to explain further. I do not hide the fact that people are not calm when they stand on this platform, they become nervous. I was nervous, too. And I probably committed a few inaccuracies in my account of this case.

M.S. Gorbachev: Good. Comrades have some questions....

From the floor: Comrades! I am not acquainted with Kolbin but I have closely followed the course of restructuring and the way that Comrade Kolbin worked in Ulyanovsk Oblast. He is one of the few oblast party committee [obkom] secretaries who stood in line for milk along with everyone else. After he visited the stores order was always established there. (Noise in hall). I have closely followed his way of working in Kazakhstan, too. There, too, his work may be assessed positively. But today (if each of us were asked this question) who can prove that bribery took place, who can resolve those questions which have not been settled in our legislation? That is all I have to say. I must say, comrades, that restructuring (and this is my personal opinion) needs people like Comrade Kolbin. (Applause).

M.S. Gorbachev: I asked for questions....

From the floor: (Inaudible).

M.S. Gorbachev: If there are any then, of course, ask them. Go ahead.

Switch on microphone 2.

A.K. Izmodenov, secretary of Sukhoy Log CPSU City Committee [gorkom], Sukhoy Log City (Kamyshlovskiy Territorial Electoral Okrug, Sverdlovsk Oblast): Gennadiy Vasilyevich! People in the Urals have long known your professional qualities. But at the same time a number of voters ask: Do you think that restructuring and the development of democracy are helped by the fact, according to our press reports, that immediately before the elections on March 26 virtually all Kazakh Communist Party Obkom first secretaries were left unopposed by alternative candidates? What is your attitude to that?

G.V. Kolbin: It must be said that initially there were alternative candidates to all the contenders without exception. What you are talking about happened at the okrug voters' meetings. Of course it must have been better with competition. But that is what happened, and the people supported it.

From the floor: Did that happen by chance? Was it a coincidence?

G.V. Kolbin: By chance. (Applause, noise in the hall).

M.S. Gorbachev: Gennadiy Vasilyevich, do you have something else to say on this matter?

G.V. Kolbin: No, Mikhail Sergeyevich, what I want to say is this, comrades. It is correct to raise the question that there must unfailingly be an alternative and that there must be 5 or 40 candidates from the viewpoint of democracy and the observance of the constitution. But there were no violations anywhere. That was people's will. And how many candidates should there be? Two, five, three? There were two, five, and then one each remained. And they were not only party workers....

M.S. Gorbachev: Fine. Further questions, please.

From the floor: Gennadiy Vasilyevich, I am not very satisfied with your answer. You were asked this question at the Supreme Soviet sitting, too. How do you view the People's Control Committee? As a system of control in the country? Then it is necessary. But if it is some kind of separate committee, as you said, and given that 90 commissions visit our enterprise a year such a committee is not necessary.

G.V. Kolbin: I would like to answer in the following way, comrades: This question requires thorough consideration because there are about 40 organizations which carry out interdepartmental control alone. There were thoughts of amalgamating them all into one but doubts appeared. I haven't been to the USSR People's Control Committee building yet, as you can guess.... All these questions must be considered in greater depth.

M.S. Gorbachev: Next please.

L.I. Sukhov, vehicle driver at the Kharkov Road Transport Enterprise No 16301, Kharkov city (Kharkovskiy-Leninskiy Territorial Electoral Okrug, Kharkov Oblast): Tell me, please, what will you do in your work to ensure that we don't have the lines of people which now greet us around hotels? How will you check the work of organs subordinate to you? How do you think that you will check that? How will work with letters be conducted?

G.V. Kolbin: I think we all have to work on this: those who are deputies, those who are not, and everyone else. (Applause).

L.I. Sukhov: That is quite clear. But how do you check whether the people's control organs lower down are working correctly? (Disturbance in the auditorium).

M.S. Gorbachev: Gennadiy Vasilyevich, is the question clear?

G.V. Kolbin: No, I did not understand the question.

L.I. Sukhov: How will you check the correctness of work by people's control organs lower down?

G.V. Kolbin: I think it is necessary first to do some work to study this.

M.S. Gorbachev: Next, please.

N.N. Koryugin, chief of the economic research laboratory at the Cherepovets 50th Anniversary of the USSR Metallurgical Combine, Cherepovets City (Cherepovetskiy Territorial Electoral Okrug, Vologda Oblast): Gennadiy Vasilyevich, at the Supreme Soviet session yesterday Comrade Ye.A. Smolentsev, who has now been elected chairman of the USSR Supreme Court, described your actions in connection with the handing back of money as unlawful. What is your view on that?

G.V. Kolbin: Comrades, I think I have answered that question. After all, Comrade Smolentsev was asked: Without a decision by the court, is this action lawful or unlawful? He said: Unlawful. But there were decisions by the courts. And therefore these actions were lawful....

M.S. Gorbachev: Fine. That is all clear. We can put it to a vote.

Sh.A. Amonashvili, general director of an experimental science and production association of the Georgian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Ministry of Public Education (from the USSR trade unions): Esteemed deputies, yesterday, when Gennadiy Vasilyevich's candidacy for this post was under discussion, it was said that he worked in Georgia in the early eighties. It so happened that we did not have time to speak then, the debate was ended. So allow me to add this to what was said yesterday: Gennadiy Vasilyevich acquitted himself very well in Georgia. He is a very principled, sensitive comrade. And another thing that gratified us: He studied the Georgian language and knew how to approach people. I think he will justify all our hopes. I am speaking here on behalf of the Georgian group of deputies. Thank you. (Applause).

M.S. Gorbachev: Let us conclude on that note.

From the floor: I have a different view.

R.A. Medvedev, writer, Moscow City (Voroshilovskiy Territorial Electoral Okrug, Moscow City): Comrades, at the Supreme Soviet session yesterday I came out against Comrade Kolbin's candidacy, and since this is not the Supreme Soviet, but the Congress of People's Deputies, I would like to explain my view in more detail.

In our country there is no truly authoritative People's Control Committee. A real, authoritative People's Control Committee is an institution no less important for our country than the USSR Council of Ministers. When Vladimir Ilich Lenin wrote his testament, the last letter he wrote was the letter "How We Should Reorganize the Workers' and Peasants' Inspectorate." Lenin wrote about the party control organ and the people's control organ that existed at that time. Both of these organs were

operating disgracefully badly. Lenin thought the two organs should be combined, making the people's control organ (which was called the Workers' and Peasants' Inspectorate at the time) paramount and attaching to it 75-100 people from the party control organ (Central Control Commission). The Workers' and Peasants' Inspectorate, combined with the Central Control Commission, should be headed by someone who would not be restrained by any authority: neither the authority of the party Central Committee, nor the authority of the party general secretary. And this person, the leader of the combined control organ, should be able to demand absolutely any document, any documentation, any reply.

Yesterday, answering our questions, Comrade Kolbin failed to show that kind of firmness and principledness. I had no confidence that he would be the kind of person who will be absolutely independent in his judgments and will show, as chairman of the people's control organ of the Congress of People's Deputies, a degree of principle that will rise above even decisions of the Central Committee—I did not have that confidence, and therefore I voted against him yesterday. And I consider it necessary to do the same again.

M.S. Gorbachev: Fine. Comrades, shall we continue the debate?

Voices from the floor: No!

M.S. Gorbachev: Fine. Who is in favor of confining ourselves to the opinions already expressed and ending now the exchange of opinions on the candidacy for the post of chairman of the People's Control Committee? Please raise your credentials cards. Please lower them. Against? Please lower them. Abstentions? The vast majority is in favor of ending the discussion.

May we decide the question of confirmation?

Voices from the floor: Yes!

M.S. Gorbachev: Who is in favor of confirming Comrade Kolbin as chairman of the USSR People's Control Committee? Please raise your credentials cards. Please lower them. Against? Count, please.

A.G. Kostenyuk: Esteemed deputies, 252 deputies voted "against."

M.S. Gorbachev: Comrades, who abstained from voting?

A.G. Kostenyuk: There were 138 abstentions.

M.S. Gorbachev: So Comrade Kolbin is confirmed as chairman of the USSR People's Control Committee. (Applause).

Yesterday, comrades, the candidacy for the post of USSR general prosecutor was discussed heatedly at the Supreme Soviet. As a result of the discussion, the USSR Supreme Soviet appointed Comrade Aleksandr Yakovlevich Sukharev USSR general prosecutor, by an overwhelming majority of votes.

Is Comrade Sukharev here? What questions do we have for him? Comrades, please introduce yourselves and ask your questions.

V.V. Gully, special correspondent of the newspaper SOVETSKIY SAKHALIN, Yuzhno-Sakhalinsk City (Yuzhno-Sakhalinskiy Territorial Electoral Okrug, Sakhalin Oblast): In my years of work on the newspaper I have collected a great many questions for the prosecutor's office, including some complaints. I will single out briefly a few of those that I regard as particularly fundamental.

Aleksandr Yakovlevich, it is important to me to know whether you think that amendments should be made to the existing law on the USSR Prosecutor's Office? If so, which articles of the law should, in your view, be changed first? Do you consider it possible for alternative candidacies for local prosecutors to be discussed before the general prosecutor appoints them? What, in your view, should be done drastically to reduce the influx of recurrent complaints to the USSR Prosecutor's Office and the law enforcement organs in general? What has been done to this end at the USSR Prosecutor's Office while you have been working there?

And one last thing. Since all my questions to you have hitherto remained unanswered (I would like to observe that I am not leaving here without answers from you), I ask you now to answer a question from a voter of mine, Military Prosecutor Butov. The point of the question is this. When will his letters about criminal abuses by Chief Military Prosecutor Lieutenant General of Justice Popov and his senior assistant Major General of Justice (if I am not mistaken about the name) Kaunin and other officials be examined? The examination of this question, my voter reports, has been "tied up in red tape" (I quote him) for 5 months by the USSR Prosecutor's Office.

M.S. Gorbachev: Aleksandr Yakovlevich, before you begin your reply.... Let us agree, comrades, to formulate the questions concisely and answer them concisely. And let us agree on how many minutes we will allow for questions and answers. Is half an hour too little? An hour? No limit?

Voices from the floor: No.

M.S. Gorbachev: Fine, then let us decide as we go along. Aleksandr Yakovlevich, go ahead, there are four questions for you.

A.Ya. Sukharev: I will answer the first question: My attitude to the law on the USSR Prosecutor's Office and whether it is necessary to amend this law. This is the 1979 law, with the amendments made on two occasions, most recently in 1987. I consider the basic principles of

this law to be correct. But I think it will be necessary to make amendments to this law because of the democratization of our life. This is a very large question, a question of principle, involving, in particular, a review, I would say, of the concept of prosecutor's supervision, so that this supervision ensures the monitoring of the rule of law over the entire field of social relations, rather than being merely narrow supervision relating mainly to criminal law. It is a question of supervision in the social sphere, supervision of legislation in the sphere of ecology, supervision of the rule of law in the economic sphere. Let me repeat: Supervision of the rule of law—and the laws should be improved in the sphere of human rights and the democratization of the process of our life. As I see it, there should be changes here. That is my answer to the first question.

Second. Do I admit the possibility of alternative candidates for the posts of prosecutors of republics, krays, and oblasts? Yes, I admit the possibility of alternatives.

The influx of complaints and letters. How do we intend to organize work with letters or complaints to the USSR Prosecutor's Office and what measures are we now adopting? Yesterday I expressed my fundamental position on this score. The essence of it is as follows. Our society is gradually turning into a society of petitioners and complainants. In the course of last year the USSR Prosecutor's Office alone satisfied 110,000 complaints, letters, and petitions from citizens. All of them, the bulk of them, should have been satisfied at the ministries, departments, and organizations in question, including social organizations. That is not right. So we are falling down somewhere here, there is a great deal of rust in our bureaucratic mechanism. Therefore we must do a great deal of very serious work to adjust this mechanism. We cannot go on like that, relying on complaints and good bosses higher up. Are we doing anything about it at the prosecutor's office? Yes, we are. We are stepping up monitoring and exactingness, becoming more demanding toward prosecutors lower down, but, to be frank, our increased toughness is not getting us very far. So it is not only a question of exactingness. We need a good legal mechanism. I advocate that a new law be adopted on work with complaints and on receiving citizens, especially in the conditions of democratization, when, to be frank, the influx of such complaints will increase. We must be prepared for that.

About military prosecutor Popov and his assistants. I will tell you frankly: I know these warnings, these complaints exist. I must look into this matter, and I am prepared, if I am given the floor, to report on it in more detail tomorrow.

M.S. Gorbachev: Any more questions?

A.L. Markevich, chief of the Obluchye freightcar depot, Obluchye City (Obluchenskiy City National-Territorial Electoral Okrug, Jewish Autonomous Oblast, RSFSR): Aleksandr Yakovlevich, as we know, the mafia and organized crime now have such means at their disposal that.... What do you think: First, is there not a real threat now that this mafia and organized crime will get their people onto the organs of power? Second. What do you think: What is the situation on this question now, do we not need a special state program to combat the mafia and corruption and the formation of a special committee, directly subordinate to the congress, on combating the mafia and corruption?

A.Ya. Sukharev: May I ask you to clarify: You are talking about the formation of a special committee?

A.L. Markevich: Yes.

A.Ya. Sukharev: Thank you. For all the significance of what we have in society now, especially when it comes to organized crime (and this kind of crime does exist, and unfortunately the trend toward an increasing proportion of organized crime in society is becoming more marked), all the same I would not wish to dramatize the situation in this respect. Still less would I say now that there is a real threat, that the mafia is, so to speak, already beginning to rule, or is close to appointing officials on the organs of power. I do not think that would reflect the actual state of affairs.

The fact that organized crime is growing, that for very many years we underestimated the significance of this kind of crime, that 57 percent of all crime in our country is mercenary crime, and that the various forms of parasitism, the various forms of this specific kind of crime have been underestimated both in the legal sphere and, I would say, in the moral, psychological, and political sphere—all this is true. We must formulate a whole program for combating the mafia, as you put it, for combating organized crime. But it should be a comprehensive program. I do not know whether we should create some kind of special committee, but at the CPSU Central Committee Legal Policy Commission recently, together with the minister of internal affairs, we reported on these proposals. We are now working on these proposals, because they are indeed very urgent.

M.S. Gorbachev: One moment, Comrade Ivanov is to ask a question. Will you read this? Well, fine. (Applause).

N.V. Ivanov, investigator for important cases under the USSR general prosecutor, Moscow City (Leningradskiy City National-Territorial Electoral Okrug, RSFSR): Since Aleksandr Yakovlevich and I are accomplices, I think one platform is enough for us both.

First question. You claim that party organs did not interfere in the course of the investigation? This was stated yesterday. Why are you misleading the people's deputies and the public, when you know that the matter

came under discussion on three occasions at the Politburo and more than once at the CPSU Central Committee and the CPSU Central Committee Party Control Committee? Why did the Politburo adopt unlawful decisions on the case twice during your term as USSR general prosecutor alone?

Second question. When a case involving a group of people is being investigated, the law does not provide for the bringing of a separate criminal case with regard to each new accomplice. Cases were not and could not be brought against the three 19th party conference delegates who were arrested: Dzhabbarov, Radzhabov, and Smirnov. Nonetheless you are misleading the public to this day by claiming that at the time of the conference a case had not been brought against them, and that a case was brought later. Why are you lying?

Third question. At the USSR Supreme Soviet sitting yesterday you stated that when Gdlyan and I published the article "Opposition" in OGONEK, we already knew that criminal proceedings were to be brought against the conference delegates in the near future. Of the four delegates we had in mind, two were CPSU Central Committee workers. And you knew that for a long time we had been trying unsuccessfully to obtain the consent of the CPSU Central Committee and USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium for their arrest. Why did you mislead the public?

Another thing. Fourth question. Even after the party conference decision you stood in the way of a positive outcome to the question of the arrest of these delegates. The conference was in June, and the first two delegates were not arrested until October, and the third in January. How do you explain that?

Fifth question. Last summer you told me (I have 5 minutes under the standing orders, I am sorry, you voted for that yourselves) that Smirnov was working under the leadership of Comrade Ligachev, and that the latter has a good opinion of him. Does not this explain the fact that after receiving the consent of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium for criminal proceedings to be brought against Smirnov on 13 September 1988, for 4 months you refused to sanction his arrest?

Sixth question. CPSU Central Committee Secretary Comrade Ligachev is not addressing the congress. It must be assumed that he has no objections to make. How do you explain the fact that having a grievance against Ivanov, instead of going to the court with a complaint or suit, he went to you, the USSR general prosecutor, that is, his subordinate? Does this not show that Comrade Ligachev is sure that you will carry out all his instructions and wishes?

Next question. (Disturbance in the auditorium.) My 5 minutes are not up yet. On 18 May, over a 7-hour period, investigators of the prosecutor's office and Ministry of Internal Affairs [MVD] from our group totally exposed you and your deputy Vasilyev as having arranged, personally and through KGB Colonel Dukhanin, department prosecutor Titov, and other subordinates, for the evidence in the case to collapse. The defendants were taken to the USSR KGB prison of Lefortovo and asked to drop their truthful evidence on the payment of bribes to CPSU Central Committee workers. In response to dozens of reports from investigators and the exposure of your destruction of the case in the interests of your mafia patrons, you expelled from the investigation group 70 investigators, including all, without exception, who had criticized you. How do you explain that? And how does it tally with your assertion that you intend to take the case to its conclusion, if you have broken up the backbone of the group?

M.S. Gorbachev: Perhaps you could sit down for the time being. I feel the answers will be lengthy. Sit down for the time being.

N.V. Ivanov: And a last question. On 19 May, over a 6-hour period, representatives of the public from Zelenograd City, which elected Gdlyan as its deputy, took part in the work of the USSR Prosecutor's Office collegium. As general prosecutor you took everything into the realms of demagoguery, decided nothing, and even declared hypocritically that you are opposed to publications about the Gdlyan group. Yet the very next day all the central newspapers except PIONERSKAYA PRAVDA published defamatory items on the group. In response the Zelenograd labor collectives held a political strike. How objectively and with what principles were you acting in this situation? Since my time limit is up, thank you for your attention. (Applause).

M.S. Gorbachev: Go ahead.

A.Ya. Sukharev: Comrades, I have to pluck up my courage, so to speak, because, as you realize, it is easier to ask questions than to answer them. Especially since there are many of them. But I will try to answer you in the order in which the qeustions were put.

So, the first question. About the party conference delegates. At the USSR Supreme Soviet sitting yesterday, touching on this question, I said that Comrade Gdlyan knew already that the prosecutor's office leadership had raised the question of who the party delegates really were. I can confirm this now. It is true. Who are we talking about? Which delegates? Dzhabbarov and Radzhabov, party oblast committee [obkom] secretaries. Comrade Smirnov, second secretary of the Moldavian Communist Party Central Committee and former CPSU Central Committee apparatus worker. And, as I understand it, the comrades raised the question, and I feel they are raising it now, too, of Comrade Mogilnichenko. What are we actually talking about? I stated and I state now: During my term in office as USSR general prosecutor there were and are no obstacles raised by the Supreme Soviet Presidium and CPSU Central Committee to the investigation, the bringing of cases, and the

arrest of individuals if there were grounds for it. You know what happened subsequently: Radzhabov and Dzhabbarov were arrested, as well as others who were not conference delegates—Usmankhodzhayev, former first secretary of the Uzbek Communist Party Central Committee, and Comrade Salimov, former chairman of that republic's Supreme Soviet Presidium. Four people were arrested, two of them delegates.

True, they were arrested rather later. This whole matter had to be studied very, very carefully. Although documents were indeed sent to the Supreme Soviet Presidium and Central Committee (since it was a question of Central Committee members and conference delegates) earlier. This whole matter had to be studied. And we are now convinced that we acted entirely correctly. Why did we act correctly? Because in my time (at that time I already held the post of USSR general prosecutor) four people were arrested, Comrade Smirnov among them. But now we have had to drop the case, because a skilled investigation was carried out with the participation of, you understand, very big lawyers, and not only good investigators, but skilled supervisory prosecutors and leaders in investigation work. And the prosecutor's office collegium discussed this matter. We came to the conclusion: What happened, comrades, was not merely a mistake, but, to call things by their names, a falsification of the case. And we apologized to Comrade Smirnov. We wrongfully arrested him (and I have to say it, so that the delegates know about this) because the whole investigation had an accusatory bias, if you like, the evidence was forced. That is the crux of the matter, that is where the differences of opinion are. I know the whole country and people beyond the bounds of our country are listening to us. Some people even said to me: Is there any need to raise these questions at the congress, could we perhaps go into it all calmly afterwards? Comrades, if I see that a man has been wrongfully arrested, if a tragic mistake has been made, then as a Communist and as a prosecutor I cannot allow an innocent man to remain in prison for a single hour. I hope that the commission that is to work on this matter will be convinced of that.

About Comrade Ligachev. You know, when two of our investigators for important cases under the USSR general prosecutor started saying openly in the mass media and before large audiences in Leningrad that certain persons from the country's highest political leadership figure in the case and then started naming names, you know, all of us who were involved, so to speak, in this case were simply perplexed. At first we did not understand what was going on. How could anyone who is not merely a lawyer, you understand, but a lawyer of such high qualifications ignore the presumption of innocence, when in fact certain things were indeed being hinted against people, and immediately unleash such things on public opinion?

I can state quite clearly that there were and are no legal grounds for such conclusions, and still less, you understand, for such public statements. And both Comrade Gdlyan and Comrade Ivanov know that very well. I think the comrades who are to be involved in the investigation, I mean the commission created by the congress, will also become convinced of this. I spoke about a case being brought against Smirnov. With regard to the commissions. Including, that is, the Central Committee commission, the Party Control Committee commission, the CPSU Central Committee Politburo commission, as was said here, and also the Supreme Soviet Presidium commission.

Comrades! What is this all about? I have only been general prosecutor for a year. Before that, I was first deputy for 3 months. You understand, I also had faith, with all my heart (I tell you this sincerely), and I still have faith. Because the so-called "Uzbek" case—I apologize to the Uzbek comrades—rather, the case of bribery in Uzbekistan involved a real interweaving of a great truth, the truth about the mafia, which exists, the truth about bribery, and a lie. You understand, a dangerous lie, as is now clear, unfortunately. Yes, a dangerous lie. Therefore when complaints began to reach the party Central Committee, and they began earlier—I said yesterday that back in 1986, in February, the prosecutor's office collegium discussed the impermissible methods used by Comrades Gdlyan and Ivanov. Yes, they were reprimanded then. This was not simply a complaint from an outsider or an injured party. No. It was the report of a supervising prosecutor, or rather, the prosecutor who was acting for the prosecution in court. But unfortunately, after these reprimands, legality was forgotten and the matter was not properly handled. Perhaps we could have saved the prosecutor's office, let me be frank, from the discomfort, to put it mildly, that it has suffered, and perhaps Comrades Gdlyan and Ivanov, too. Do you understand? That is why I am having to speak about it now. But this did not happen, although there were complaints. And they increased. There were more and more of them. So what should the party Central Committee and the Supreme Soviet Presidium have done? What should they have done with all these letters, complaints, and so forth?

Comrades, you know, yesterday I was informed that out of the nine charges in the Gaipov case, the Uzbekistan Supreme Court retained only one, and that one is dubious, and it has submitted a partial ruling to the general prosecutor. So now, comrades, the court has established and reported to the general prosecutor violations of the rule of law by Gdlyan and Ivanov. I have to respond—this is the reality.

I will tell you another thing. When we were preparing the Churbanov case, there was a hitch—the gray-haired lawyer who was prosecuting for the state (many of us saw him on television) came up to me and said: "Comrade General Prosecutor, I cannot go on with these charges, because there is much that is contrived, much that is not backed up by evidence." But all the same, he went along with it. And do you know what happened? One of the defendants was acquitted in the end. With regard to

another defendant, Yakhyayev, the case was singled out as a separate case. Why did they do this? Because, to be frank, our investigators acted unlawfully when they saved up, so to speak, in reserve, the Yakhyayev case, concerning his moral and ethical qualities and violations of the rule of law while he was Uzbek minister of internal affairs. And of course, the Supreme Court (as general prosecutor I have to acknowledge this) acted correctly. You cannot do things like that, that is the point, and we have to reckon with it. Legality is paramount, if we really want to create a rule-of-law state, however hard we may find it. I realize that this concerns the department, its prestige and authority. I understand all that, but we cannot postpone these questions "to a later date." We must resolve them immediately, once complaints come in. We are in favor of the fight against crime, but with clean hands and a clear conscience—that is the point. (Applause).

Comrades, I realize I am taking up too much of your time. Reproaches have been made here against the general prosecutor and the KGB. Absolutely unsubstantiated reproaches. What are we talking about, comrades? The name of investigator Dukhanin was mentioned. Who is Dukhanin? An investigator, a highly skilled investigator of the USSR KGB. Combined teams have long been the practice in the work of the USSR Prosecutor's Office, the USSR MVD, and the USSR KGB when it is a question of major crimes. And that is how we acted in this case. After all, you know that this case—it was reported in the press—began originally in 1983, when KGB workers and their investigators had already restored R10 million of stolen money to the state. Only later did the case come over to the prosecutor's office. Throughout the investigation team's work, the KGB helped us operationally. The question has now been raised, when did Dukhanin join the investigation team? He is not the only one, 12 of their investigators joined. They joined, comrades, because the case had been in progress for 6 years. World experience knows no other example of a crime investigation dragging on for 6 years. People were in prison, under guard, for 3 years (and in some cases more).

Therefore we could not go on allowing the case to drag on endlessly. We decided to work on it together. Comrade Dukhanin was one of those who worked on the case with regard to Usmankhodzhayev, Smirnov, Radzhabov, Dzhabbarov, and Salimov. As I said, we had 12 of these investigators from the KGB. There were approximately the same number of investigators from the Military Prosecutor's Office and the USSR Prosecutor's Office. Comrade Smirnov was in the KGB special prison, we had many people there under investigation. Very many, unfortunately, both there and in the USSR MVD fourth special prison. The question was one of interrogating the witnesses who are under guard and have given incriminating evidence against Smirnov, because from the very first Smirnov, while admitting various kinds of moral and ethical violations that he committed, has categorically denied bribe-taking or any involvement in it. They started interrogating the witnesses, because many things did not add up, there was much that was, you see, strange and erroneous, that much was obvious. Who came to that conclusion? It was not Cormade Dukhanin. It was the supervisory prosecutors who came to that conclusion, as they did, unfortunately, with regard to other defendants, too. They are a group of 12 people which I, as general prosecutor, set up back in December. And Comrades Gdlyan and Ivanov know very well what became of the charges when these independent prosecutors had a look to see what kind of evidence they had been given. Is there, as we say, a case to answer? That is the question. And when they began to look with, so to speak, the supervisory eye at all these matters, and when Comrade Dukhanin started to check the validity and strength of this evidence, it turned out that not only was there no evidence, but people even started to say: We were forced to incriminate ourselves, and forced to incriminate Comrade Smirnov, too. Forgive me, but this happened because of pressure, blackmail. Things must be called by their names. And I have already told you the outcome. Comrade Dukhanin honorably fulfilled his duty, and you will find that out for yourselves if you set up a commission to investigate.

You will excuse me, comrades, I may have forgotten something, I may have omitted to answer some of the questions, but I think I have said what is most important. That is the main thing. We must have the rule of law, the rule of law must triumph. (Applause).

You will excuse me, I have one more thing to say. Last year—in only 1 year (of course, it is not only a matter of Comrades Gdlyan and Ivanov, that is not the main point)—we were forced to release 2,182 people either from special prisons or from the courtroom, because these people had been wrongfully arrested, because they had been wrongfully repressed. That is a disgrace! In all, 6,500 of these people have suffered. I am only talking about the people who were, so to speak, under guard. This is a matter of principle. (Applause).

M.S. Gorbachev: Your question, please.

A.A. Yaroshinskaya, correspondent of the industry and capital construction department of the newspaper RADYANSKA ZHITOMIRSHCHINA (Zhitomirskiy Territorial Electoral Okrug, Ukrainian SSR): Esteemed Aleksandr Yakovlevich! This is my question. It is taken from letters from my voters, addressed to you personally and carrying thousands of signatures. You obviously know about the gross violations of the Law on Elections that occurred in Zhitomir City. Some 6 weeks ago I personally sent you a letter, as a deputy, to say that events in Zhitomir are gathering pace. Obviously you must know, if you read my letter, that in Zhitomir, after 26 March, 48 administrative cases were brought against my agents and the activists who helped me with the nomination and campaigning, others were expelled from the party, and 3 servicemen—2 lieutenant colonels and a colonel—ended up in hospital. Despite the fact that 6

weeks have passed since I wrote to you, I have received no reply. From love of commissions, obviously, from our universal love of commissions, a commission came to our city of Zhitomir—four prosecutors. When I joyfully told my friends this, they retorted that four prosecutors could not come to Zhitomir and defend the truth just like that. I protested that they had come to defend the truth. You know, the four prosecutors were working in our city for nearly a week, if you multiply it out, that comes to nearly a month of work. I think a month was long enough to check and recheck several times the facts that were set forth in my voters' letter. But I repeat, more time passed, Zhitomir is in turmoil, people are indignant at the lawlessness, and we have received no clear reply from the USSR Prosecutor's Office. I would like to repeat our question today, and to receive a clear answer. Both I and my voters want to know when the lawlessness will end in Zhitomir, and if the prosecutor's office does not reply, who else should we turn to? Thank you. (Applause).

A.Ya. Sukharev: Tell me, please, if you can, when was your question submitted?

A.A. Yaroshinskaya: I sent my question via Comrade Nazemtsev, who came to Zhitomir. That was 6 weeks ago. There is a copy of the question in LITERATURNAYA GAZETA.

A.Ya. Sukharev: First, I wish to apologize on behalf of the prosecutor's office and my subordinates, and doubtless I myself am to blame here. But I want to tell you that we are currently receiving 2,000-2,500 letters a day (I am not complaining, as general prosecutor I am supposed to impose order). I understand what a deputy's question is, and once again I ask your forgiveness, I will look into it and give you a reply. But at the moment I am not able to answer this question.

A.A. Yaroshinskaya: Thank you, we will be waiting eagerly.

Yu.N. Afanasyev, rector of Moscow State Historical Archives Institute (Noginskiy Territorial Electoral Okrug, Moscow Oblast, RSFSR): Aleksandr Yakovlevich! More than a month ago a group of people's deputies, about 40 of them, submitted a question to you and a proposal on amending the preventive restrictions on the members of the "Karabakh" Committee. You met with this group just before your appointment to the post of general prosecutor. Until now, for more than a month, you have not favored us with any sign of attention. So we are addressing this question to you. We realize, of course, that some questions are difficult, even for the general prosecutor. But nonetheless, what do you have to say about these preventive restrictions on the members of the "Karabakh" Committee? That is the first thing. And, second, how would you react to the ethical problem: 40 deputies ask you a question, and you keep silent for more than a month? That is one question. A second question, on the case of Surgutskiy—former director of the "Tuchkovskiy" state farm [sovkhoz]. Proceedings were taken against him on unsubstantiated charges, and he was in the special prison for about 2 years, and then was entirely vindicated on the grounds of the absence of elements of a crime. He was also expelled from the party, but was subsequently reinstated in the party and reinstated in his job by a court decision. However, that court decision has not yet been implemented, after many months. He has sent letters and telegrams to you. And for many months you have not favored him with any reply. What do you have to say about the fact of the nonimplementation of the court decision, and also on the question of this ethical side of the matter? Why do you not answer Surgutskiy?

A.Ya. Sukharev: I understand your questions. I wish to answer you, Comrade Afanasyev, Deputy Afanasyev, as follows. When you sent a telegram to the USSR Prosecutor's Office on the subject of the "Karabakh" Committee, I did not learn of your message, unfortunately, until 8 days later. You were contacted and a discussion took place, as was reported to me. I believe you, of course, but I also place reliance on the reports of my comrades, my deputies and assistants, who handled this case. You said that you were about to leave for Leningrad and would entrust the matter to your agent, who works with you. His name was mentioned. The comrades telephoned twice more to say that your question was now being studied by the general prosecutor personally. Incidentally, I telephoned you, too. But at the time, I was told, you were on a foreign trip.

The question itself has been resolved. The preventive restrictions on the members of the "Karabakh" Committee against whom a criminal case was brought have been amended. The comrades are now in Armenia. You know that. I have nothing more to add here. I agree with you that it is better if the general prosecutor responds to such complaints, however busy, so to speak, he may be. But I will be frank with you, the volume of work is colossal. And all the same, I must think about how I should respond in such situations now, when we are discussing deputies' questions.

For instance, I have already received 500 questions from deputies here. Well, what of it? That is what the general prosecutor is for, people say, so that every day he has the opportunity to answer all questions in full. I am considering this matter and I ask your forgiveness, Comrade Afanasyev.

And as for the case concerning the director of the "Tuchkovskiy" sovkhoz, my position here is unequivocal: If there is a court decision, it should be implemented. That is the law. That is my position. I simply cannot tell you why it has not yet been fulfilled. I must investigate to see what the problem is here.

A.B. Demin, captain, troop unit deputy company commander for political affairs, Siberian Military District, Kochenevo Urban Settlement (Barabinskiy Territorial Electoral Okrug): Aleksandr Yakovlevich, I also want to

ask you a question. A voter of mine who was the victim of an attack in 1985 has appealed to me. He is a militia worker. The attack was carried out by militia workers—his bosses. And from that day to this he has wanted the culprits to be punished. But wherever he turns—the MVD, the USSR Prosecutor's Office, the RSFSR Prosecutor's Office—no measures have been adopted. These people who committed the attack on him were dismissed from the militia organs. But recently they have been reinstated, and he has begun to receive various threatening notes.

The man is under protection. A militiaman, his cousin, is protecting him. Therefore I would like to ask: Why have you not replied to my deputy's question, which I submitted to the congress secretariat? And why have no measures been taken all this time on this case?

A.Ya. Sukharev: Comrades, I can....

A.B. Demin: I wanted to add something. An investigator came, he was there for 3 days, he said: No one is to blame. You are not Bukharin, he said, that you should be investigated, and he went away. That is it—that is all that was done.

A.Ya. Sukharev: I did not catch that, forgive me, could you say it again?

A.B. Demin: I want to know, why were no measures adopted all that time?

A.Ya. Sukharev: Fine. Comrades, in order to reply to the deputy, and these are often quite complicated cases—both criminal and civil cases— in substance and not merely formally, or at least to indicate the thrust, so to speak, of what has been done in connection with the complaint, I need time. You may resent this, you may demand more organization and discipline on my part. But I will tell you frankly: I cannot do this in 3 days. It would be frankly blasphemous, do you understand? I think, if I am not mistaken, you have already asked me about this, and I told you what I know, that an investigation into instances of red tape is now taking place on this question. And I said that we will certainly adopt measures if we find red tape, if we find a culprit we will certainly punish people. You will receive a reply.

A.B. Demin: Thank you, I hope he will be released from his fear.

(Disturbance in the auditorium).

M.S. Gorbachev: Comrades, one moment. I hear people wanting to stop the questions. But please take note of the fact that there are six comrades at one microphone, and four more over here. In all there are 11, no, 12. There are 12 people wanting to ask questions, so you must take a decision in the light of this.... Now there are 13. What shall we do, shall we continue the questions?... Fine. One moment, you are asked to allow Deputy Sakharov to ask a question. Voices from the floor: Let him.

M.S. Gorbachev: So shall we give Academician Sakharov the floor, and then stop?

Voices from the floor: Yes.

M.S. Gorbachev: Those in favor of this proposal, please vote. Please lower your cards. Against? A lot, comrades, a lot.... Comrades, I must bring this information to your notice. I see that approximately—something in the region of—nearly 40 percent are opposed to limiting the discussion. In this situation I would continue the questions.

Voices from the floor: Yes.

M.S. Gorbachev: I simply think that would be the right thing to do. (Applause). And let us not be in a hurry here, comrades. Please be patient. Go ahead.

A.D. Sakharov, academician, chief scientific staffer of the P.N. Lebedev Physics Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences, Moscow City (from the USSR Academy of Sciences): My first question is this. For a long time the idea has been expressed in the press and in public circles that the prosecutor's office should not conduct investigations at all, that the sole task of the prosecutor's office is to monitor compliance with the law. And that in cases where investigations are carried out by the prosecutor's office, this task cannot be effectively carried out with regard to the way in which investigations are carried out. That is my first question.

Second question. What is your personal view of the idea that an attorney should without fail be involved in the investigation from the moment that charges are brought?

Third question. What is your view of the idea that an extension of the period spent in detention during investigations should be permitted only in absolutely exceptional cases, which require the very highest sanction and the most overriding arguments? That is one group of questions.

Second group of questions. For many years I have been receiving a great many letters from people who, in their view, were unjustly convicted. These people sent me documents concerning matters on which they have appealed to the prosecutor's office, attaching detailed arguments from attorneys' statements and their own explanations as to why they were wrongfully convicted. And the replies from the prosecutor's office were also attached. They always went like this: "There are no grounds for a review of the case." No arguments to support this were cited, and we know from the press that in a number of cases these replies were written purely automatically. My question to Comrade Sukharev: What is his view of this practice, and will order be achieved in the work of the prosecutor's office so that all replies to

complaints are not merely formal, but really carefully argued? As for my personal experience, I wrote a supervisory complaint to the prosecutor's office on the conviction of my wife and I received precisely the same reply, in the same form.

Next question. What is Comrade Sukharev's view of his close colleagues, prosecutors Katusev and Galkin? The point is that I have important information that a public statement by Katusev was one of the triggers leading to the Sumgait tragedy, while Galkin virtually folded up the investigation and the entire conduct of this case. Is that so? Perhaps my information is incorrect, but I would like an answer to this question.

Finally, my last question: What is Comrade Sukharev's view on the article—it was an interview, apparently—that he gave in 1975, on the subject of the case of Sergey Kovalev?

A.Ya. Sukharev: Thank you, Comrade Sakharov. First question: What is my view on the status of the investigative apparatus within the framework of the prosecutor's office? My view is negative. I think the investigative apparatus should be autonomous, and the job of the prosecutor's office, as Lenin conceived of it, is to exercise prosecutor's supervision, and not only in legal proceedings on criminal and civil cases, but, as I have already said, on the entire range of social relations that are regulated by the law. That is a colossal task. (Applause).

My attitude to the attorneys' service and their involvement at the stage of investigation: This is not only necessary, it is absolutely essential. If this had been done consistently, perhaps today we would not be talking about the things that we are talking about with great regret.

The third question. On extending the period of detention only in exceptional cases. I entirely agree with Comrade Sakharov. This is the only way, the only way. I think it is possible for us, if we are really creating a rule-of-law state, to work in this way. So that this is indeed the exception, rather than the rule, as it has become in a number of components of the prosecutor's office investigative apparatus, and MVD workers, too.

About letters from those unjustly convicted, and replies lacking substantiation. I think you are right here, Comrade Sakharov. There are very many such letters. Even now there are very many. I myself, when these letters reach me, try to provide the arguments, and I demand the same of my subordinates. But it is a colossal task, and there is a great deal of formalism and, I would say, callousness, although, of course, the climate is changing for the better in this respect, and so is the work.

Next question. My view on Cormade Katusev and Comrade Galkin, especially as regards Comrade Katusev's statement on the Sumgait events. I would simply like to ask you, Comrade Sakharov, to understand my position correctly. I think there is an element of misunderstanding here. Of course, the events were fairly complex, in many ways unexpected, and people were demanding interviews and immediate glasnost. I suppose Comrade Katusev may, so to speak, have made a bit of a blunder or been inaccurate in his expressions, but to say that this was what sparked off the turn of events in this tragic way is, of course, wrong.

Voices from the floor: (Inaudible).

A.Ya. Sukharev: Absolutely right. And as for Comrade Galkin, I simply urge you to understand. I believe that Comrade Galkin has done everything necessary, that in less than a year he and his group have investigated all the Sumgait cases and all these cases have been passed on to the court. And many of them have already been tried. This is the same Comrade Galkin who is now the leader of the group investigating the Uzbek cases and I must tell you, comrades, about the Galkin who is engaged in such complex work, because not a single line has yet been written about him. That is to add to the portrait of Comrade Galkin. Further, I accept and do not rule out that in 1975, in giving an interview, I may have given the relevant assessment. Comrade Sakharov, I want you to understand my credo, my attitude toward cases of so-called "anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda" under the well known article 190/1. This attitude has long been known. Many lawyers present here know it. It is a principled attitude, we must review a lot in these questions, and I was one of the authors of their solution on democratic lines. I think that is right.

A.N. Boyko, department chief at Donetsk State University, Donetsk City (Donetskiy-Voroshilovskiy territorial electoral okrug, Donetsk Oblast): Esteemed Aleksandr Yakovlevich, yesterday and today you spoke of how the prosecutor's office and investigation should act with clean hands. That is pleasant to hear. But many voters are coming with complaints that their appeals go through the USSR Prosecutor's office twice, three times, or more, to the people against whom they are complaining and your department is not interested in whether they were acted against with clean or dirty hands. The question is as follows. What do you intend to do to eliminate this violation of the well-known USSR Supreme Soviet Decree? That is the first question. Second question. It is well known that in the quite recent past many people found themselves in psychiatric institutions for political reasons. But it emerges from 31 May LITERATURNAYA GAZETA items that the practice of involving psychiatrists in investigations is continuing and there is a question here for you. I shall go on to quote how these people were acted against dishonestly and with dirty hands. I quote: "Society is to blame with regard to these people and must redeem all its guilty, I am sure of it. I think that without waiting for any requests or petitions from the victims we must review absolutely all political cases of those years and with them the psychiatric diagnoses of all 'socially dangerous individuals' as well."

The question is as follows. What is your opinion, will you review these cases, since many people are turning to me and are, naturally, seeking truth and justice in this matter.

A.Y. Sukharev: I understand. I shall answer the first question, about complaints. This practice is continuing, I have already mentioned it. There are cases when complaints eventually find their way to be resolved to the very people against whom the complaints are leveled. That practice does exist. What is the way out? Despite the organizational measures to enhance responsibility, and that is being done now, I can see that this is of little benefit. I have already spoken on this subject. We need a new, renewed law, with a consideration for democratization, so that everyone in our country can indeed work to satisfy complaints, to satisfy complaints at the initial stage, when they are merely appearing, and then I think we will have order. We should have a good normative base so that even if someone initially wanted to avoid resolving a complaint, it would be difficult to do so. Yet this is being done without ceremony right now. Here is the point: A new law is needed. I am sure of it.

With regard to the LITERATURNAYA GAZETA article and to this entire problem as a whole, although in my view Academician Kudryavtsev has already spoken about it. We have a new normative base which makes it possible to monitor more stringently the facts which actually took place. Now we have created a special team as a result of these new alerts to check everything in the press and what complaints there are on this score. Our position is that in these matters there should not only be no violations but not even any doubts on this score. Today the line in the state and in law enforcement practice is very firm and precise.

M.S. Gorbachev: Please go ahead.

From the floor: I have the following question. In 1962-1970 you worked in the CPSU Central Committee Administrative Organs Department and at that time many of us appealed to that department about the exile of the great poet and now Nobel Prize winner Iosif Brodskiy. I would like to know your attitude toward the matter. At that time, in 1968, when you were chief of the sector for the prosecutor's office, court, and justice organs in the CPSU Central Committee, there was a trial of five participants in a demonstration connected with the invasion of Czechoslovakia. I would like to know your attitude toward that and also toward the toughening of the regimes in the camps which took place in those years when the supply of food to concentration camp stores in fact became the same or even worse than in Stalin's time. I would like to know all this because at the time, obviously with the aid of the administrative organs, an attempt was made to turn back the thaw and the positive phenomena of the "Prague spring" and to end it. Do you assess this negatively now and what is your position on these questions now?

A.Ya. Sukharev: Yes, of course. With regard to my work in the CPSU Central Committee Administrative Organs Department in the seventies. Yes, I was indeed deputy chief of the administrative organs department and later, in the years of which you speak, I became chief of a sector of that department and was concerned with the justice organs. We had a sector for questions of the Internal Affairs Ministry, and I mean by that that I had access to the solution of questions which were assigned to me on the basis of my department. Now, as for the poet Brodskiy. I had nothing to do with those questions. I shall say frankly that I had no access to that case. I have already formulated my attitude now absolutely precisely. Much of what happened in our country was wrong and deformed, not only did we lack the proper legal base, but we had very serious misinterpretations and distortions. I have already spoken about this. About Czechoslovakia. I was not in Czechoslovakia, I was not sent there. I visited Czechoslovakia later, as a member of a delegation in connection with my legal work. That is all I can say about that.

People's deputy (no name given): I ask you to touch on the trial of the five people who protested on this score. They were tried in Moscow. In particular Larisa Bogoraz and....

A.Ya. Sukharev: You want to know my attitude? Now? But I have already stated my attitude. Today I would approach these questions in an absolutely different way from what what was the case on that occasion. But, I repeat, I had nothing to do with that trial.

M.S. Gorbachev: Please, your question.

People's deputy (no name given): Please tell us, you are president of the Association of Jurists of the Soviet Union. That post obliges you to spend a long time abroad. It follows from your answers to questions that very many questions have accumulated in the country which must be resolved today. Next, why, although you live in Moscow and are in this auditorium today as a USSR people's deputy, are you sitting among the delegation from the Checheno-Ingush Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic [ASSR]? A question in this connection: Why did you run as a USSR people's deputy for the Checheno-Ingush ASSR?

A.Ya. Sukharev: You know, I am and remain for the time being president of the Association of Jurists of the USSR. Soon we will have a jurists' union and in the near future there will be an all-union constituent conference. I head the Association of Soviet Jurists. But I do not think that the president of the Association of Soviet Jurists should spend a long time abroad. I have been abroad and established contacts on various questions, especially with regard to the struggle for peace, the humanization of our domestic policy, and the consolidation of cooperation. I shall say frankly that we have done a lot through the channels of the Association of Soviet Jurists. But I do not think that its future president

should mainly devote his activity to foreign ties. We have very many domestic problems. We must engage primarily in legal culture and many other matters.

With regard to my position as a deputy. I am not a deputy from the Checheno-Ingush ASSR. I have the seventh national-territorial okrug, which unites the Checheno-Ingush ASSR, the Dagestan ASSR, and Astrakhan Oblast, where an enormous population mass lives. I was elected there and I am standing here and sitting among among this group of deputies because the okrug itself and that okrug's headquarters were and are in Groznyy City. I am sitting with the entire delegation. Thank you.

M.S. Gorbachev: Questions, please. Shall we stop?

Voice from the floor: Yes.

Voices from the floor: No, no, it's still quite early.

M.S. Gorbachev: Good. I was in favor of stopping, comrades, but I can see that the deputies feel otherwise. Comrade Sukharev, please sit down. Good, I think that in this case we must give the floor to Comrade Gdlyan.

T.Kh. Gdlyan, senior investigator for particularly important cases at the USSR General Prosecutor's Office, Moscow City (Tushinskiy Territorial Electoral Okrug, Moscow City): Miracles are taking place, comrades. We are working closely here with the general prosecutor.

M.S. Gorbachev: Comrade Gdlyan, you have 5 minutes. Is that alright?

T.Kh. Gdlyan: Why 5 minutes?

M.S. Gorbachev: In accordance with the standing order.

T.Kh. Gdlyan: These are complex questions and they should be heard by the deputies and the eminent congress. It is to elect the country's general prosecutor. A complex question. A quite controversial figure, to put it mildly, and naturally the deputies want to know who to vote for, what [as published] to abstain from and who to vote against. How can all this be done in 5 minutes? And in general, we are in a very great haste, Mikhail Sergeyevich.

M.S. Gorbachev: Please begin, Comrade Gdlyan.

T.Kh. Gdlyan: Comrades, this is what is at issue. I would like to put a question to Aleksandr Yakovlevich Sukharev, the aspirant for the post of USSR general prosecutor. Aleksandr Yakovlevich, you still have not answered the question of whether or not party organs, including the CPSU Central Committee, and the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium intervened.

A.Ya. Sukharev: I reply that during my work as USSR general prosecutor and when I was first deputy general prosecutor for 3 months there were no such cases (Comrade Rekunkov, the former USSR general prosecutor, told me this). I declare this with total responsibility, and this can be established from documents.

T.Kh. Gdlyan: I must responsibly expose the USSR general prosecutor in the presence of everyone.

M.S. Gorbachev: Wait, you are to ask questions.

T.Kh. Gdlyan: One moment, why questions?

M.S. Gorbachev: You will make a statement later.

T.Kh. Gdlyan: Today?

M.S. Gorbachev: Yes, today. Now ask your questions.

T.Kh. Gdlyan: Right. Because they are fundamental questions. Understand, comrades, we are in a hurry, we.... But....

M.S. Gorbachev: Ask questions.

T.Kh. Gdlyan: Tell me, Aleksandr Yakovlevich, why did you yourself participate together with your subordinates in causing the collapse of the case that you and other comrades quite unjustly call for some reason "Uzbek," although there is no "Uzbek case?" Remember, general prosecutor, it is, rather, a "Moscow, Kremlin case, not an Uzbek" one.

M.S. Gorbachev: Comrade Gdlyan, listen....

T.Kh. Gdlyan: Please.

A.Ya. Sukharev: Well, comrades, what I think, some things I already....

M.S. Gorbachev: Comrade Gdlyan, formulate your questions, and the general prosecutor will answer them.

T.Kh. Gdlyan: I have said that.

M.S. Gorbachev: Ask all your questions.

T.Kh. Gdlyan: Together with his subordinates and workers, certain workers of the USSR KGB, he participated, as USSR general prosecutor, in causing the case to collapse, committing unlawful actions in respect of what he called the "Uzbek" case, although I have said what kind of case it is. This is a specific question.

M.S. Gorbachev: Have you any other questions?

Voices from the floor: Yes, ask questions!...

T.Kh. Gdlyan: We will not get to the bottom of it like this, comrades. You understand how it is. One asks—another answers.

(Noise in the hall).

M.S. Gorbachev: Comrade Gdlyan, this is not a television debate. You ask as many questions as you have, and we will listen to the answers.

T.Kh. Gdlyan: Good. Tell me with what the dismissal of Gdlyan and Ivanov from the leadership of the USSR Prosecutor's Office investigative group was connected. Were there, to put it more accurately, legitimate grounds for this, or were you carrying out someone's instructions, someone's social imperative? I mean in this case the party organs in the form of the CPSU Central Committee. Precisely those circles, I emphasize, so that there is no demagoguery here, those circles that are not interested in further investigating this now generally tragicomic affair.

Fourth. If you beat your breast with regard to your principledness, stating that you declared war on mafioso groups and you will see all this through to the end—in particular, the case that we were investigating—then say why approximately 70 investigators, the very best investigators of this investigative group, people who spent years going through this school and who knew everything, were sent packing by your orders. Professional specialists will understand what it means to change horses half-way into a crossing, so to speak. Why did you do this, and will new people ever understand, particularly when, as you put it, people sit for many years in custody? We, too, are against people sitting in custody for many years. This is my question, please.

M.S. Gorbachev: Do you have any other questions, Comrade Gdlyan?

T.Kh. Gdlyan: Yes.

M.S. Gorbachev: Go ahead.

T.Kh. Gdlyan: He still has not answered the questions. (Noise in the hall). Wait, it is necessary to answer when questions are asked. When he gave an answer at the 19th party conference as general prosecutor, he misled the entire party forum. He said that criminal proceedings were not instituted, and so no investigation was conducted. This is a question of principle, comrades. Why? Because it just will not do when the general prosecutor lies. And we will prove this, because there are jurists here who will give a conclusion. One moment. They will give a conclusion on whether or not criminal proceedings must be instituted. And now, in order to confirm this, I will tell you....

M.S. Gorbachev: Ask questions, Comrade Gdlyan. Have you asked them all?

T.Kh. Gdlyan: No, not all.

M.S. Gorbachev: Well, ask them, ask all the questions.

T.Kh. Gdlyan: When will I make a statement? Today?

M.S. Gorbachev: Today, today.

T.Kh. Gdlyan: One moment, comrades. Tell me, Aleksandr Yakovlevich, why did you go out of work time, so to speak, behind the back of the investigative group, to Usmankhodzhayev, former first secretary of the Uzbek Communist Party Central Committee, in the investigation prison and together with Vasilyev, your deputy, persuade him to renounce his incriminating testimony against Moscow bribetakers, above all party bribetakers, that is, bribetakers in the CPSU Central Committee? Why did you need to do this? And after you reflected this in the minutes of the interrogation, your deputy spent another 4 days going to the investigation prison on your orders and extorting from the former first secretary of the Uzbek Central Committee a statement written in his own hand that he renounced that testimony. Why did you need to do this, and whose orders were you carrying out? Moreover....

M.S. Gorbachev: Please put questions.

T.Kh. Gdlyan: The sixth question. When you were convinced that it was awkward for the general prosecutor and his deputy to go and extort testimonies, that is, to demand that the accused people renounce the testimonies, then you and Vasilyev, your deputy, instructed Prosecutor Titov and KGB Investigator Dukhanin to move the accused from the No 4 investigation prison of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs to a USSR KGB investigation prison in order there, by using the most unlawful methods (noise in the hall)—one moment—by using the most unlawful methods, to try to secure a renunciation of incriminating testimonies once again and above all in respect of Moscow bribetakers. Why did you do that?

Further. When the case collapsed in such an unlawful manner in front of everyone's eyes, we were taken off the investigation. At that time, when agents were messing up the criminal case behind our backs, we repeatedly came to you and raised the question—not only we but also the entire investigative group, in which there were approximately 60 investigators from all ends of the country, as well as militia and prosecutor's office workers—asked and demanded that this lawlessness be ended. You took no measures. Why?

Voices from the floor: That's enough.

A.Ya. Sukharev: Good, thank you. I believe, comrades, that I have already answered in part, and I want to say it once again. We can argue endlessly over whether or not there was intervention. I urge you to turn to the documents. I say once again that there was no intervention by

the Central Committee or the Supreme Soviet Presidium. I even think that if the Supreme Soviet Presidium had intervened, it would have been intervention in a good sense, because we are, after all, an accountable organ. If there had been alerts, it would have been necessary to react sooner. I blame myself, too, because I am the general prosecutor. I must answer for legality. Perhaps there was no need to speak of many things today, I will say frankly. There was no intervention. The commission will report everything to you documentarily. This is the answer to the first question.

Now with regard to the collapse of the case. You see, when a charge is worded in such a general form, if I may put it this way, then it is, of course, very complex to reply. Do you understand? With what was the dismissal of Comrade Gdlyan and Ivanov from work precisely on the investigation into the case of bribes in Uzbekistan linked? I took that step with the greatest of difficulty.

I realized what the response might be. I realized all this perfectly, but my colleagues—members of the collegium, members of the party committee—said to me: Comrade Sukharev, you are the general prosecutor, why do you not take measures? Because these workers in the investigative section—this applies not just to Comrades Gdlyan and Ivanov, for there were other investigators there, who will be mentioned—are completely evading prosecutor's office supervision. That very group of supervising prosecutors, which was set up for the first time last December, established that it was not just a question of innocent people sitting there. It was established there that the charges had been preprogramed, to put it crudely, and a very great deal was adjusted to fit that.

And then comrades' eyes began to open. They said: Listen, how is it possible to work like this? But what happened then? When alarm signals came in and it was necessary to set these alarm signals in legal motion and check them, Comrades Gdlyan and Ivanov demonstratively said: No commissions, no checks. Fine, no commissions. But there is the general prosecutor, give him an opportunity to check. Complaints may be addressed to me, but under the constitution I am responsible for my subordinates. No, they closed the safe, closed the files, closed the complaints—the very ones that we must check. They closed the documentation connected with all kinds of valuables. That is all, there are none.

What is more, reports from my deputies, from leaders of other subdivisions began to reach me. What is being done in the prosecutor's office? Whoever you say this to, they will not believe this. Therefore we had difficulty and pain in our soul, because we knew how this might affect the Uzbek case.... I beg your forgiveness for such an expression; once again excuse me. But this really was so. And only after this did we invite Comrade Gdlyan to the collegium and say—let us conduct a professional conversation. Perhaps you are right in some way that you are, in fact, nervous and afraid. "No, we will go to the people." But, comrades, are such questions of justice really decided by the crowd? You will excuse me, I greatly respect the voters, I understand their feelings now, I very much understand these feelings. But, as general prosecutor, when it is a question of the great social truth, I cannot defer these questions from today until tomorrow. If that's the way you want it, let me go, I will never agree to such a thing. This is the question. It was for these reasons that they were dismissed. (Applause).

Now with regard to the 65 investigators. Comrades, this is not a discussion for the unenlightened. There are 209 people in this investigative group, a giant, huge group. Of course, I realize how all this was presented and, probably, to begin with maybe, all this was necessary and essential. But why, one wonders, keep such a number of people for many years? Not just anyone but precisely a supervising prosecutor who was in the investigative group—Comrade Popova, she is probably listening to me now—came herself some 6 weeks ago; yes, Comrade Popova, whom Comrade Gdlyan trusts fully, wrote a report: Many investigators do not work at all, there is no organization or control, and the group must be reduced by—I do not remember now—30 or 40 people. But when we began really investigating the organization of this work, we arrived at the conclusion that a maximum of 100 people are needed there, particularly at the concluding stage of the work. But they must work, really work, and not like this—work 1 day and rest for 2. We have already seen excesses there, when people sit idle for years.

For many years it was not a permanent staff, as Gdlyan and Ivanov say. No, people changed. I will say frankly that some of these comrades, too, worked for too long, and we dismissed them. I will say frankly that we had very serious complaints against some comrades.

Allow me, Comrade Gdlyan, to answer the next question with regard to the fact that the general prosecutor went to Usmankhodzhayev in prison behind your back, began dissuading him, and so forth. I wish to speak straightaway so as to avoid misunderstandings. If the general prosecutor is trusted, then under the constitution he not only can but is obliged to check everything and must take nothing on trust. It has been like this with us for too long. (Applause). Nothing else is permitted. (Applause).

After you, Comrade Gdlyan, very suspiciously—you will excuse my use of this expression—visited Usmankhodzhayev, I was sent a statement. We had established a special work procedure. Not because these are some special people, no. There was simply no order before. Three people worked with these last five, because they were arrested under me. This is what is at issue. And it turned out that Comrade Gdlyan was there precisely on his day off, on a Sunday. We do not practice such a thing at all. After that move I was sent a statement. What kind of statement, do you think? First. This at once put me on my guard. "I trust Gdlyan alone and I want him to investigate my case, and not the three investigators who

were doing so hitherto." A very peculiar coincidence, let us state frankly. It very much put me on my guard. And second—a whole string of all kinds of names appeared. When I and the deputy general prosecutor, at Usmankhodzhayev's own request, invited him, since he was asking to say something very serious, he said—You know, much of what I wrote did not happen. I said, but you yourself admit that you really engaged in bribes. Yes, he replied, I admit it, but what I wrote did not happen. I said: "All of it?" No, not all of it, but a great deal. As regards certain names. Once the names cropped up in some mysterious circumstances. Then there were none. I met with Usmankhodzhayev at his request only 6 months later. I regret that three statements from him were addressed to me but for some reason reached me only 3 weeks later. And when I met with him again, not only had his position been confirmed but much had been said, too. In the sense that he was not to blame for everything and not as guilty as people tried to portray, I will say frankly—even to compel this person. A very great deal is now coming to light.

Now with regard to Security Committee workers' messing up the case. Comrades! I would not like to repeat yet again what I have already said. They are, believe me, honest, decent, and, I would say, selfless people. We live in different times and will properly assess all organs—both justice and KGB organs. But, believe me, they are working people, they are honest people. And I am not ashamed to speak about these people, to say that they were doing and did do a great thing together with us, under the leadership of the prosecutor's office, under our supervision. (Applause). Need I answer?

From the floor: No.

M.S. Gorbachev: That's all. Good. Thank you.

A.Ya. Sukharev: Then, the comrades who asked me questions please approach, and I will gladly answer them. (Applause).

M.S. Gorbachev: So, comrades? Shall we go on? We can still listen to comments or statements. But, perhaps, this is what we will do. We appointed Comrade Sukharev at the Supreme Soviet. Perhaps we should examine this now?

Our commission has begun working and will check everything, including the actions both of the general prosecutor and of the investigators and the facts relating to how things stand with the involvement of high-ranking persons in bribetaking, that is, it will investigate everything. If the commission's conclusions are such that we must draw the necessary conclusions on the basis of this, including with regard to the general prosecutor, we will draw them. But does the question arise now of casting doubt on the Supreme Soviet decision to appoint the general prosecutor?

From the hall: No.

M.S. Gorbachev: One minute. I told Comrade Gdlyan that in addition to questions, he may take the floor later to make a statement. Well, comrades? Good. Thus, I understand correctly that we are ending the discussion.

The hall: Yes.

M.S. Gorbachev: Whoever is in favor of confining ourselves at this stage to this exchange of opinions that has taken place, please vote. Please lower your identity cards. Against? Please lower. Abstentions?

We are ending. Now the question of appointing Comrade Sukharev to the post of USSR general prosecutor. Will we decide now?

Deputies: Yes.

M.S. Gorbachev: One minute. The question has already been decided. Comrades, I heard everything when you spoke. That was why I asked whether or not we will continue the discussion and speeches. The congress advocated confining ourselves to this. Let us work like this.

Who is in favor of approving the USSR Supreme Soviet's appointment of Comrade Aleksandr Yakovlevich Sukharev as USSR general prosecutor? Please vote. Please lower your identity cards. Who is against? Please count.

(The votes are counted).

M.S. Gorbachev: We will have a short closed session. Therefore I ask the guests and the press, while we vote, to give us an opportunity to hold a brief session. We thank you for participating in the work today. I ask the deputies to remain in the hall.

A.G. Kostenyuk: Comrade deputies, 330 deputies voted against.

M.S. Gorbachev: Who abstained, comrades? Please count. The opinion has arisen in the Presidium.... I am told that in this case it is necessary to count who voted "for." Why? Because the Presidium has formed the opinion that some people are both voting "against" and abstaining. The same people are voting. Yes, yes. Well, this is the opinion of members of the Presidium. Therefore we will count who was in favor of approval.

A.I. Lukyanov: Then we will know.

A.G. Kostenyuk: Precisely 273 deputies abstained.

M.S. Gorbachev: Comrades, please understand me, I must return to the voting. Whoever favors approving Comrade Aleksandr Yakovlevich Sukharev, please vote. Please count.

(The votes are counted).